



Front Matter

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967)

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4434999>

Accessed: 21-11-2023 08:01 +00:00

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

I Y 20960 F

HISTORIA

**ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ALTE GESCHICHTE · REVUE D'HISTOIRE
ANCIENNE · JOURNAL OF ANCIENT HISTORY · RIVISTA
DI STORIA ANTICA**

UNTER MITWIRKUNG VON

F. E. ADCOCK / CAMBRIDGE · ANDREAS ALFÖLDI / PRINCETON

T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON / CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

VICTOR EHRENBERG / LONDON · JULIETTE ERNST / PARIS

ALDO FERRABINO / ROMA · ANDRÉ PICANIOL / PARIS

JOSEPH VOGT / TÜBINGEN

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

HERMANN BENGTON / MÜNCHEN · KARL STROHEKER / TÜBINGEN

GEROLD WALSER / BERN

BAND XVI · SEPTEMBER 1967 . HEFT 4



FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH · WIESBADEN

INHALT DES XVI. BANDES, HEFT 4

Abhandlungen

B. C. DIETRICH (Rhodes University, Grahamstown), Some Light from the East on Cretan Cult Practice	386
G. J. STAGAKIS (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee), ΟΙΙΑΩΝ in the Iliad	414
THOMAS KELLY (University of Alberta), The Argive Destruction of Asine	422
W. PEREMANS (Université de Louvain), Diodore de Sicile et Agatharchide de Cnide	432
ERICH KOESTERMANN (Kiel), Ein folgenschwerer Irrtum des Tacitus (Ann. 15, 44, 2ff.)?	456
W. WILLIAMS (University of Keele, Staffordshire), Antoninus Pius and the Control of Provincial Embassies	470
JOHN MATTHEWS (Balliol College, Oxford), Continuity in a Roman Family; the Rufii Festi of Volsinii	484

Miszelle

R. D. MILNS (University of New England), Philip II and the Hypaspists	509
---	-----

Redaktion: Prof. Dr. HERMANN BENGTON, 8 München 22, Universität,
Geschwister-Scholl-Platz, Seminar für alte Geschichte.
Prof. Dr. KARL STROHEKER, 74 Tübingen, Lindenstr. 52.
Prof. Dr. GEROLD WALSER, Bern, Engeriedweg 21.

Beiträge werden an die Herausgeber erbeten. Erwünscht sind Manuskripte in Schreibmaschinenschrift und einseitiger Beschriftung.

Die Herausgeber verpflichten sich nicht, unverlangte Manuskripte abzdrukken und Besprechungen unverlangter Rezensionsexemplare zu veröffentlichen.

Sonderdrucke: Der Verlag liefert den Verfassern 25 Sonderdrucke der Aufsätze, 15 Sonderdrucke der Miszellen unentgeltlich. Bestellungen auf weitere Sonderdrucke gegen Berechnung bitten wir dem Verlag spätestens beim Übersenden der ersten Korrekturen aufzugeben.

Erscheinungsweise: jährlich 4 Hefte zu je 8 Bogen (= 128 Seiten).

Bezugspreis: pro Heft im Abonnement DM 14,—, Einzelheft DM 16,—.

Herstellung: J. J. Augustin, Glückstadt i. Holst.

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

Printed in Germany



Some Light from the East on Cretan Cult Practice

Author(s): B. C. Dietrich

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Sep., 1967, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967), pp. 385-413

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435000>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

ABHANDLUNGEN

SOME LIGHT FROM THE EAST ON CRETAN CULT PRACTICE

Much has been written on Cretan religion since Sir Arthur Evans began his monumental work of excavation at Knossos early in this century. The evidence uncovered by him and other archaeologists at the various sites on the island is full and often detailed, but, Linear B apart, cannot be interpreted with the help of written sources. It is entirely archaeological in nature and, in Nilsson's famous phrase,¹ "has come down to us as a picture book without text." Therefore, until we possess a reliable decipherment of Linear A – and probably even then – it is important to draw on outside sources, where possible, in order to advance our knowledge of Cretan religious practice which at present is almost exclusively understood from internal evidence and from largely contemporary finds from the Greek mainland.

Minoan religion did not, of course, come about in a vacuum some time during the Bronze Age, nor did it develop in isolation from other notable cultures of the period. The island of Crete formed an integral part of a larger Aegean community which recent archaeological and linguistic studies have shown to be closely connected. Scholars from Sir Arthur Evans onward have firmly believed in the flux of religious good, as early as Neolithic times, coming from the East – Egypt² and Asia Minor³ –, but until very recently little or no definite proof has been available to substantiate such reasonable theories. Within the last ten years, however, the horizons of our knowledge regarding the Aegean cultural community have widened to a remarkable extent, and it has become abundantly clear that the Greek and Cretan religious world owed a heavy debt to the Eastern peoples of Anatolia, Syria and Egypt.

Religious beliefs conceived in the Near East travelled westward in a series of one-sided migratory movements from Neolithic times. The likely routes of such movements have been charted elsewhere and need not be set out again.⁴

¹ M. P. Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*², Lund 1950, 7.

² A. Evans, *The Palace of Minos at Knossos*, London 1928, e.g. II, 22; IV, 983; cf. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) e.g. 9.

³ E.g. F. Chapouthier, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* LII (1928) 314 ff.; W. Déonna, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* LVIII (1934) 1 ff.; and many others.

⁴ See Dietrich, "Some Eastern Traditions in Greek Thought," *Acta Classica* VIII (1965) 13 f. Some of the most important work in this field was done by F. Schachermeyr, *Die Vorderasiatische Kulturtrift, Saeculum V* (1953) 268–84; *Die ältesten Kulturen Griechenlands*, Stuttgart 1955; *Die minoische Kultur des alten Kreta*, Stuttgart 1964, especially 13 ff.; cf. *Das ägäische Neolithikum*, Lund 1964.

They generally ran in one direction – from East to West –, continued over many centuries and began in the Neolithic Age; although it is now impossible to establish exact dates beyond the beginning of the Bronze Age, or, more precisely, earlier than about 2700 or even 2500 B.C., with the help of contemporary dating tables from Egyptian and Mesopotamian dynasties. This *terminus* may well be pushed backward in time; but for our purposes it will suffice to recognize the relationship between East and West at the turn of the fourth millenium when in spirit the Greek and Cretan worlds may be said to have had strong ties with Asian culture.⁵

Crete lay well in the path of these migrations which occurred immediately preceding and during the Early Bronze Age; and, according to Schachermeyr, she was further subject to a secondary series of movements which brought her into contact with Egypt and Northern Africa.⁶ In this way Crete became at this early time a part of a wider cultural group which, amongst others, shared some common linguistic features with the East,⁷ as well as aspects of religious cult. This point is evident from several parts of the Cretan religious scene. For example the design, purpose and function of the Minoan palace comparative archaeology has shown to derive partly from Eastern models.⁸ The very

⁵ Cf. Schachermeyr, D. äg. Neol. 5, "Kann doch nun kein Zweifel mehr darüber bestehen, daß wir es in Griechenland mit einer Randprovinz der weit überlegenen Neolith- und Chalkolithkultur Anatoliens zu tun haben." ⁶ Schachermeyr, D. min. Kult. 16f.

⁷ It appears that before the beginning of the Bronze Age there developed in Anatolia the use of a language, marked by the suffixes -nd/t- and -s(s)-, which came to be shared by the people of the Western Aegean, and which survived in numerous place names, like Kindyassos, Myriandos, Laranda, Blandos and so on – see Schachermeyr, D. min. Kult. 16. For the theory that Phoenician – a Western Semitic language – was spoken in parts of Greece and Crete during the Bronze Age, see M. Astour, *Hellenosemitica*, Leiden 1965, 357, and Cyrus H. Gordon in a number of articles cited by Astour in his bibliography. For other theories see L. R. Palmer, *Mycenaeans and Minoans*, London 1961, 26; 232ff.; cf. J. Zafropulo, *Mead and Wine*, London 1966, e.g. 28.

⁸ L. Woolley compares with the Cretan palace that of king Yarim-Lim at Alalakh in Northern Syria, and that of Zimri-Lim at Mari, see *A Forgotten Kingdom, Being a Record of the Results obtained from the Excavation of Two Mounds Atchana and Al Mina*, in the Turkish Haty, Baltimore 1953, 74f. Cf. Astour, op. cit. (see n. 7) 328. For other examples, e.g. from the land of the Hatti, see H. Otten, *Die Religion des alten Kleinasien* (Handb. d. Oriental.), Leiden 1964, 109. The same architectural dependence has been established for the Greek mainland. Schaeffer shows that the palaces at Tiryns and Mycenae were modelled on North Syrian examples, like the palace at Ugarit, C. F. A. Schaeffer, "Les fouilles de Ras-Shamra – Ugarit," *Syria* XX (1939) 292; "Reprise de recherches archéologiques à Ras Shamra – Ugarit," *Syria* XXV (1946–8) 4f. For a more detailed survey of such parallel architectural features see R. W. Hutchinson, *Prehistoric Crete* (Penguin Book) 1963, 166–9; 213; 218; 219; 225; 311f. Schachermeyr, D. min. Kult. e.g. 118ff.; 222ff., now believes that the similarity in construction of the palaces in East and West was due in M. M. to a mutual influence which brought about a type of koine in palace building. Local differences in East and West are discussed by F. Matz, *Minoan Civilization, Maturity and Zenith* (C. A. H. vol. II, ch. IV (b) and XII), Cambridge 1962, 9f.

technique and style of the frescoes on their walls, as well as much of Minoan glyptic art, largely drew from Eastern models.⁹

The palaces, the bulk of the seal engravings and frescoes belonged to Cretan religious life; and their connection with the East clearly shows the direction from which much of the original religious impetus came to the island. It is now impossible to construct a graph marking the principal areas of contact between East and West, and thus determine with a fair measure of precision the localities from which religious beliefs and practices were imported to Crete. Such areas are to be found in Syria and Anatolia. Their influence on Cretan religion becomes evident from ethnographic, linguistic researches, as well as from comparative archaeology which prove the presence of, for example, Phoenician, that is Western Semitic, colonies in west and eastern Crete which in the latter area may have arrived not later than the beginning of the second millennium B.C.¹⁰ These peoples, the Eteocretans according to Homer,¹¹ of course, brought with them their language and cults.¹²

The Phoenician contribution, however, to Cretan religious life with few exceptions, like the Europa myth for example, at present remains vague. Much more fruitful in to-day's state of our knowledge is the astonishing correspondence, dating from Neolithic times, between certain features of Cretan and Anatolian cultures, particularly in the south-west portions of the latter. Schachermeyr's work in the remains of Neolithic and Bronze Age pottery in the Aegean area revealed to him the ties between Greece and Crete and south-west Anatolia, especially sites like Hacilar and Çatal Hüyük.¹³ Professor John Evans, excavating the Neolithic levels at Knossos, again discovered, "that the first neolithic inhabitants there arrived with pottery and crops that can only be derived from western Anatolia".¹⁴ So far a brief outline of relevant material which allows the hope that discoveries in the Near East may be expected to throw fresh light on the Cretan religious scene. Therefore considerable promise was attached to excavations of s.w. Anatolian Neolithic sites, such as Hacilar and Çatal Hüyük, begun in the fifties and early sixties and continuing to this day.

⁹ Alalakh, and perhaps from the palace of Zimri-Lim at Mari, where the Knossos style frescoes appeared some hundred years or more (c. 1750) before those at Knossos; see Woolley, *op. cit.* (see n. 8) 74 and Hutchinson, *op. cit.* (see n. 8) 179. Professor T. B. L. Webster kindly pointed out to me that according to Mr. Seton-Lloyd the Mari frescoes were not the same technique as the Cretan frescoes. On seals and miniature carvings see e.g. Hutchinson, *ibid.* 148f.

¹⁰ Astour, *op. cit.* (see n. 7) 347. The dates of Phoenician arrivals in the West remain uncertain. It is quite possible, so Prof. F. C. Fensham kindly informed me, that Astour's dates are too high. Cf. J. Boardman in his review of Astour's book in *Class. Rev.* XVI, 1 (1966) 87.

¹¹ Od. 19, 176.

¹² Cf. C. H. Gordon, cited by Astour, *ibid.*

¹³ For references see n. 4 above, and especially D. Åg. Neol.

¹⁴ Cited from Mellaart (see the next note) 1963, 78.

The site of Çatal Hüyük lies in the Konya Plain of s.w. Anatolia and was discovered in 1958. Actual digging there did not begin until 1961, under the guidance of James Mellaart, and the results so far of three campaigns have been published in three preliminary reports.¹⁵ From these we gather that Çatal Hüyük was "the capital site of the Konya Plain," and that its remains give evidence of the high cultural level attained there¹⁶. At the time of publication of the third report in 1964, the excavators had not yet reached virgin soil, but they established some ten separate main levels^{16a} to which eventually were assigned the dates ranging from 6500 – 5700 B.C.,¹⁷ which means that there was a temporal overlap between the last levels of Çatal Hüyük (II–O) and some early levels of Hacilar (IX–VI).¹⁸

To allow a quicker impression of earlier levels Mellaart carried on the digging in two areas: one from the top of the mound (area A), and the other on its western slope (area E).¹⁹ The sixth level revealed five separate shrines in various states of preservation, all forming an integral part of the city's "agglutinative" building complex. In the third campaign (1963), which saw more extensive excavations than the previous years, the areas A and E were linked up and three more shrines came to light in Level VI which, however, had to be subdivided into the earlier level VIB and the later Level VIA.²⁰ This same campaign also revealed three more shrines. The subdivision of Level VI, it seems, has little bearing on the cult continuity of the different shrines, for, generally built in VIB, they endured to the end of VIA or were replaced. Below Level VIB eight shrines were found in Level VII,²¹ and perhaps six in the not yet fully explored Levels VIII–X.²²

All these shrines, where possible, have been reconstructed and fully described by Mellaart,²³ and it will be enough to refer to them in the pages of his reports. Mellaart's examination already established that throughout the period represented by about ten levels – that is the space of one thousand years – the form of cult observed in these shrines varied little if at all, for, certainly from Levels VI–X – the levels from which we have the best shrines – the basic principles of architectural construction remained identical.²⁴ Also the continued use of a particular shrine over periods represented by more than one level, such as the first five shrines discovered from Level VIA and B, as well as, in many cases, the construction of a new shrine on the same sacred ground,

¹⁵ J. Mellaart, "Excavations at Çatal Hüyük", *Anatolian Studies* XII (1962) 41–65; XIII (1963) 43–103; XIV (1964) 39–119.

¹⁶ A. S. XII, 42; 46.

^{16a} A. S. XIV, 40.

¹⁷ A. S. XIV, 118.

¹⁸ Op. cit. 116. These dates obviously are subject to change in the light of future discoveries, op. cit. 118.

¹⁹ A. S. XIII, 54.

²⁰ A. S. XIV, 40; 41. For comparison of the previous VI with the later VIA and B see Figs. 1 & 2.

²¹ A. S. XIV, 50.

²² Op. cit. 70.

²³ A. S. XIII, especially 50 ff.; figs. 3 & 4; figs. 8–18; A. S. XIV, 40–73 figs. 4–10; 12–25.

²⁴ A. S. XIV, 73.

where the old had stood,²⁵ proves continuity of cult.²⁶ Similarly, wall-paintings, reliefs, and the technique of figures cut into the plaster of the walls, were not confined to the shrines of any particular level, but occurred throughout all the periods.²⁷

These points strongly argue that in all its Neolithic history Çatal Hüyük practised continuity of a certain type of cult which did not vary in its essentials. Therefore the date of a level to which a particular shrine belonged has comparatively little bearing on the significance of the cult paraphernalia found there. A first glance at Mellaart's reconstructions of the Çat. H. shrines reveals some surprising correspondences between these and certain features of Cretan Bronze Age religion. However, there is much that cannot be paralleled in Crete at any time, including some apparently unique architectural features of the Anatolian shrine, at least one of which was built with a clerestory raising the centre of the structure.²⁸

A good part of the cult 'furniture' itself seems unique, such as the women's breasts modelled in plaster on the east walls of the First and Second shrines of Level VIB,²⁹ containing either the lower jaw of a wild boar,³⁰ or the head of a vulture with beak projecting beyond the nipples.³¹ Such breasts – whose obvious connection with fertility needs no comment – , if anything, call to mind the Ephesian Artemis rather than any Minoan goddess.³² A great deal, too, of the wall painting in the different shrines, either decorative or of human skulls and bones, structures of reed and mat,³³ paintings of kilims,³⁴ or even of a town and volcano,³⁵ appear alien to Cretan motifs. The vultures, again, which figure prominently in a number of paintings in the shrines at Çat. H. – often together with headless corpses of men³⁶ – , although their significance as scavengers cleaning human bodies of flesh may well be obvious, find no clear echo in Crete.³⁷

²⁵ A. S. XIV, e.g. 40; 42; 45; 70; 73 for examples from Levels IV, VII, VIII, IX, X.

²⁶ There are also examples, however, where houses came to be built on former sites of shrines, so that Mellaart speaks of a continuity of cult in Çatal Hüyük "not as absolute as in Mesopotamia," A. S. XIV, 45.

²⁷ Certainly from Level VI to the earliest levels, A. S. XIV, 45; 73.

²⁸ The Second Shrine of Level VIB (EVI, 10), A. S. XIII, 70 and fig. 14.

²⁹ EVI, 8; EVI, 10.

³⁰ EVI, 8 A. S. XIII, 69.

³¹ EVI, 10. Op. cit. 70.

³² Cf. A. S. XIII, 80. Mellaart may well be right in believing the vulture and boar to represent death, but the use of piglets as victims during the Greek Skirophoria and Thesmophoria is not a good example in this connection. Why only the heads and jaws of these animals? Perhaps they belonged to a cruel and primitive rite which failed to survive.

³³ A. S. XIII, Pl. XXVI, a; b.

³⁴ A. S. XIV, Pl. XI, b.

³⁵ Op. cit. Pl. VI, a.

³⁶ E.g. A. S. XIV, Pl. IX, a; b; Pl. XII, a; b; Pl. XIV, a; Fig. 20; 21; 22.

³⁷ Mellaart suggests – A. S. XIII, 80 – that these birds were the forerunners of the Cretan griffins. There is, however, not enough evidence extant either to confirm or reject such a thesis. The griffin, like the sphinx, in Cretan art was very common in many scenes by no means always of a chthonic or funereal nature – see especially Nilsson, op. cit. (see n. 1)

Equally unparalleled³⁸ in the West are the numerous 'panels of hands' painted on the walls of houses and shrines in Çat. H.³⁹ They were done in black or red and occasionally with four fingers.⁴⁰ Their significance is mysterious.⁴¹ One might be inclined to suppose that such hands were felt to suggest divine power and presence, like the separate human ears and eyes represented on Cretan seals.⁴² But this interpretation, too, is wrought with great difficulty, for at least one panel, in a house of Level VI (EVI, 15), shows fifty-seven hands of children.

These are some of the more striking divergencies between the places of cult at Çatal Hüyük and Crete; and they serve to sound a note of caution to the historian of comparative religion. To begin with Mellaart's work on the Eastern site is by no means complete. The results of future campaigns are bound to affect earlier interpretations of the archaeological material: corrections will have to be made and perhaps some theories discarded. What has been discovered thus far, most certainly belonged to a religion known in part to Crete by virtue of the cultural and ethnographic ties which bound the two centres. But, even if the earliest levels of Hacilar overlapped with the last of Çatal Hüyük, a space of three thousand years or more separated the latter Neolithic cultures from Bronze Age Crete. Inevitably the religious good which originally found its way into Crete from Anatolia, not only came to be mixed or juxtaposed with ideas from other areas like Egypt, for example, but also was shaped in new, perhaps less barbarous, forms by the developing Cretan spirit and culture. Such, however, is the nature of our material, and we have to work with

368 n. 96. The only certain fact known about these creatures is that they were imported to Crete from the East, *op. cit.* 255, probably from Syria, H. Frankfort, "Notes on the Cretan Griffin," *B. S. A. XXXVII* (1936/7) 106ff. The griffin's position in Cretan belief is uncertain: the animal was frequently associated with a goddess, perhaps a Mistress of Animals. In all likelihood, like the daemon, the griffin was an attendant to divinity rather than divine itself – cf. Dietrich, *Death, Fate and the Gods*, London 1965, 16. Thus its function on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus – the head-end – drawing the goddesses' car was parallel to that of the horses – at the foot-end – harnessed to a similar car – see F. Matz, *Götterscheinung und Kultbild im minoischen Kreta* (Akad. d. Wissensch. u. d. Literat.), Wiesbaden 1958, Pl. 12 & 13. Nowhere is there any clear proof that the griffin in Crete was involved in funeral cult. The ring of Nestor most probably is a forgery, cf. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 50. Therefore, more firmly than ever one should restate Picard's phrase – C. Picard, *Les Religions Préhelléniques* (Crète et Mycènes), Paris 1948, 198, "on sera réservé sur le culte funéraire du griffon."

³⁸ One possible parallel is the hand modelled together with a scorpion, snake and other animals on a heart-shaped gold amulet from a tomb near Hagia Triada, Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) fig. 152.

³⁹ A. S. XIII, Pl. XI, a, b; XVIII, b; A. S. XIV, Pl. VI, a–c.

⁴⁰ A. S. XIII, Pl. XII, a, c.

⁴¹ Mellaart, A. S. XIII, 81, notes that a similar sign of a four fingered hand, placed sideways, occurs on a pot in a woman's grave at Hacilar, and he believes that the hand was an apotropaic sign, or the signature of a person who participated in a cultic ceremony.

⁴² Dietrich, *op. cit.* (see n. 4) 22.

it in the best way possible, at the same time hoping to avoid the more obvious pitfalls of conjecture.⁴³

Yet there is another side to the coin: much of the religious belief which governed cult in the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age in the Aegean area had not only been introduced from the Near East, but was uniform in a number of basic concepts.⁴⁴ Furthermore, certain elemental features of cult in the Aegean communities, from the Near East to Crete and Greece, one suspects, as tenaciously kept their hold on popular imagination as did the sacred cult locality itself which, in many instances, endured not only throughout the thousand years or more of Çat. H., but also in some localities in Crete and Greece, where cult can be shown to have continued on the same site at times into the Christian era.⁴⁵ The continued use of one locality for cult purposes does not always, of course, even in the religious conservatism of the Neolithic and later Aegean religious scene, signify that the content of such cult remained unaltered. Therefore, particularly in view of the long gap of time involved, it is advisable to proceed carefully when comparing certain Anatolian with Bronze Age Cretan religious features.

There are, however, some correspondences between East and West which can reasonably be explained by the relationship of the two centres. As far as can be gathered from the remains and reconstruction at Çatal Hüyük, all the shrines there formed an integral part of the city's "agglutinative" building complex: although they obviously were places of worship and religious ceremonial, these shrines were in no way separate from the other domestic quarters. They further, either in part served as store rooms for produce or granaries, or were flanked by chambers or rooms for this purpose.⁴⁶ This functional use, an important reflection on the nature of the cult and deity revered there, the Çatal Hüyük shrines shared not only with the later palace sanctuaries or the palaces themselves in the East, but also with Crete and Greece. There is no reason to doubt, but that the significance of this practice was the same in every instance: the deity in or about whose shrine the produce was stored had been responsible for its growth and owned it.⁴⁷

A remarkable feature of the Anatolian shrines consists in the important part played by animals: leopards, boars, heads of rams, moulded into the walls, figured prominently. The most important animal in the shrines of all

⁴³ In addition to the chronological gap between East and West, one must also bear in mind that the migratory movements described above cannot yet be established with full certainty.

⁴⁴ Cf. Dietrich, *op. cit.* (see n. 4) 13.

⁴⁵ Perhaps the most striking examples in this connection come from cave cult which suffered change and developed in form but endured on the same site. The famous cave at Amnisos in Crete, for example, with some interruptions saw cult from Neolithic to Christian times, Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 58. Similarly, on the mainland of Greece the Parnes cave, south of Phyle, was the scene of a cult which continued from prehistoric to Christian times, Nilsson, *ibid.* 67.

⁴⁶ A. S. XIII, 70ff.

⁴⁷ Cf. e.g. *Acta Classica* VIII (1965) 23.

levels was the bull, obviously as vital to popular religious belief here as in Crete. A large figure of a bull was often modelled *in reserve* on the plastered wall, usually the north wall.⁴⁸ Very frequently walls were fashioned with a single bull's head, or with a row of heads occasionally beside one or several heads of rams.⁴⁹

Of special interest for our purposes is the motif on the east wall of the First Shrine from Level VI.⁵⁰ The central panel of this wall, in the upper register, has a row of three painted bulls' heads separated by knobs and flanked in the right panel, at the same height, by the head of a ram. With this arrangement we may compare the scene on a Minoan gold signet ring found by Schliemann as part of a treasure south of the Shaft Grave Circle at Mycenae. The ring is reproduced by Bossert.⁵¹ On it we see two registers of bull and goat heads, three each, attached side by side to a wall and separated by a row of knobs, as far as can be made out from the badly worn surface of the ring, not unlike the Anatolian examples.⁵² The similarity between the two representations is evident, whatever we believe about the nature of the cult of which they were part.⁵³

The bull crania attached to the walls of many shrines obviously represented the whole animal, occasionally found in the same shrine. These heads, therefore, together with another remarkable feature of the Anatolian shrine, at last solve the long disputed question of the origin and significance of the so-called Minoan horns of consecration. In Çatal Hüyük not only the head could stand for the whole bull, but also the horn cores, usually mounted in a rectangular, pillar-like, structure, or along the sides of a bench seven deep.⁵⁴ At times all three forms – the whole animal, the head, and “bull pillar” – occurred together in one shrine.⁵⁵ The separate horns of the Anatolian shrines⁵⁶ were the ancestors of the Cretan horns of consecration which had been imported to the island direct from the East: in spite of the curious stereotype shape they assumed in Cretan hands – a point that gave rise to much speculation concerning their significance⁵⁷ –, the association with the figure of the bull, as well as the important position they held in cult, is evident from the Anatolian finds.⁵⁸

⁴⁸ In three separate levels: Shrines VI, 8; VII, 8; IX, 8; A. S. XIII, 67; XIV, 70.

⁴⁹ See e.g. the First Shrine in Level VI, EVI, 8, A. S. XIII, figs. 8–13.

⁵⁰ EVI, 8, A. S. XIII, fig. 12. ⁵¹ Altkreta³, fig. 392e.

⁵² A. W. Persson, *The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times*, Berkeley 1942, 76, describes these knobs as rosettes.

⁵³ Compare the several crania in association with a goddess in a religious scene from a famous Minoan ring found in the same treasure, Tsountas, *Revue Archéologique* (1900) Pl. VIII, 1. It has been suggested by Mellaart, A. S. XIII, 79, that in Crete the goat replaced the ram in religious representations for reasons of ecology.

⁵⁴ E.g. Shrine AVI, 1, A. S. XIII, fig. 4.

⁵⁵ E.g. EVI, 8, A. S. XIII, fig. 9.

⁵⁶ They were also found in a shrine at Beycesultan, Seton Lloyd-J. Mellaart, *Beycesultan* fig. 16. ⁵⁷ See Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 183ff.

⁵⁸ Cf. Schachermeyr, *D. min. Kult.* 157.

The bull in Çatal Hüyük quite obviously was the object of worship: he could be represented merely by the head or the horn-cores. It follows that wherever the horns might be found, in caves, as at Patso,⁵⁹ in peak sanctuaries,⁶⁰ in funeral cult, as on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus, in shrines, or elsewhere in the Minoan palace, they bespoke the presence of the bull and the divine powers symbolised by that animal. This does not imply, of course, that horns were cult objects, for they occasionally served as ornamental motifs to Cretan artists, but they were more than receptacles of instruments used in religious rites.⁶¹ The connection between the horns of consecration and the bull are ignored at one's peril in any attempt to define the former's precise cultic function which depends, therefore, on a knowledge of the part played in Anatolian and Cretan religious belief by the bull. And, even when due allowance is made to the temporal gap between the two cultures, we can expect to learn about the religious nature of the Cretan bull from the Eastern practice. To this we shall return below.⁶²

⁵⁹ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 167 and fig. 68.

⁶⁰ See e.g. the steatite rhyton from Kato Zakro, "Archaeological Report for 1963-4," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* LXXXIV (1964) fig. 39.

⁶¹ This thesis, originally suggested by Sir Arthur Evans, is supported by Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n.1) 183f.

⁶² The Cretan horns, aside from their now obvious relation to the bull, still present a number of problems, for in some aspects their cultic usage apparently differed from the Anatolian model. With one likely exception from Mochlos (E.M. – Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) I, 57 fig. 16C), most of the Cretan horns belong to L.M. II, III, with a few examples from M.M. II and III. Their shape has changed and seems at times to have only a tenuous connection with the original bull horns. More important is the fact that the horns in Crete came to be associated with other objects, normally placed in their middle, of which there is as yet only a weak or no trace at all in Anatolian shrines. The most common object in this connection was the double axe: in Cretan religion a frequent and important part of the cult paraphernalia both by itself and in association with the horns. Examples are too frequent and well known to require special quotation. The origin and significance of the Cretan double axe is still obscure and need not detain us here (for the Near Eastern and Anatolian origin of this implement see Schachermeyr, *D. min. Kult.* 161 and refs.). So far it occurs only once in Çatal Hüyük in a wall painting from House AVI, 6 (A. S. XIII, Pl. VIII (b)), in no wise obviously connected with the bull horns. Its butterfly shape, with the handle projecting in equal length from the axe head, was well known to the Chalcolithic Near East, as well as to Bronze Age Crete, as can be seen from a sealing from Phaestos (Schachermeyr, *ibid.* fig. 86; 87). The presence of the axe in Neolithic Anatolian wall painting adds strength to the well founded theory that this implement, too, had been imported to Crete from the East (Cf. *Acta Classica* VIII (1965) 25), and perhaps originally from Anatolia. Beyond this we cannot go. In the painting at Çatal Hüyük the axe is shown beside other symbols which at present defy interpretation, but rather tend to deepen the mystery surrounding the position of the double axe in Cretan cult, where, for example, at times a sacred knot replaced the shaft of the axe in a symbolic arrangement which "became the prototype for a decorative device of the later L.M. I ceramic style" (Evans, *ibid.* I, 433, fig. 310 c-e). Neither the Anatolian example nor the instance of the Minoan axe in cultic use bear out Schachermeyr's thesis (*ibid.* 161) that this implement was the symbol of power in a matriarchal Cretan society.

The remains of the Anatolian shrines under discussion emphasize the vital part played in religious belief by certain types of animals; a point which equally applied to Cretan cult, although, apart from the bull, ram (goat), stag, and leopard, the Cretan animals included in their ritual differed from the Eastern types. Neither snake nor lion occurred in Çatal Hüyük in painting or plastic art; instead of the dove or raven – well known to the Cretan – the former painted figures of the vulture which so obviously was thought to exercise a special function in burial or funeral cult. It is most likely that, beside the divergent geographical and climatic conditions, there were other reasons at play to explain the differences. Of greater value for our purpose is the fact that both in East and West these animals were felt either to possess divine powers themselves or, at any rate, they were closely associated with the deity revered in the shrine or cult locality where they occurred. This association between animal and deity – generally a goddess – was quite pronounced in Çatal Hüyük and may well have a bearing on a similar close relationship in Crete between the so-called Mistress of Animals and her animal; a point which will be discussed in greater detail later in this essay.

A great many shrines at Çatal Hüyük showed the figure – sometimes to a height of ten feet and more⁶⁸ – of a goddess modelled in plaster usually against the west wall.⁶⁹ This goddess, sometimes represented twice or three times in the same shrine,⁷⁰ marks the nature of the cult practised in these shrines as one concerned with fertility and birth in particular.⁷¹ The goddess' arms are raised and bent at right angles at the elbows in a gesture familiar from Neolithic figures in the Aegean area, as well as from numerous Cretan statuettes and idols. This attitude of the arms has been convincingly explained as a "Segnungsgestus".⁷² The legs of the goddess are raised and in the position of giving birth, not unlike several Neolithic figures from the East.⁷³ She

⁶⁸ EVI, 10, A. S. XIII, 70 and fig. 14.

⁶⁹ This seems mostly to be true of the shrines of the Sixth Level, although in some cases the goddess was also found on e.g. the east or south wall. EVIB, 31 shows three figures: one on the west wall, another on the south wall, and the third on the east wall of the shrine A. S. XIV, fig. 7 and 8.

⁷⁰ Cf. the previous note. It seems doubtful whether one may call the figure on the west wall of Shrine EVI, 14 an example of the "Twin Goddess", A. S. XIII, 75 and fig. 18.

⁷¹ A. S. XIII, 79.

⁷² See S. Alexiu, "Die Göttin mit den erhobenen Händen," *Kretika Chronika* XII (1958) 179 ff.

⁷³ See e.g. Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* fig. 69. Compare also the many remarkable Mycenaean figures of nude females shown sitting in a chair with arms raised and in a similar attitude. These were found at Delphi and in numerous tombs, Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 305 f. and fig. 149, and incidentally recall the white (sitting?) female figure painted on the wall of a shrine from Level IV at Çatal Hüyük, A. S. XII (1962) Pl. XIII, a, b.

obviously was a Mother Goddess,⁷⁴ also portrayed, with pronounced female attributes, in a great many statuettes found in the same shrines. Birth, the act of birth, appears to have been her main concern: she was modelled on the walls in the attitude of labour. Once she was shown as pregnant,⁷⁵ but several times as actually giving birth, graphically described in a clay figure from the shrine in Level II.⁷⁶

Remarkable is her association, and even identification, with her special animals, the bull, ram and the leopard. Not only do these animals share the most prominent positions of the shrine with the goddess, but she also gives birth to a ram,⁷⁷ or to a bull.⁷⁸ She may either appear in animal form or perhaps be represented by one, as in the so-called Leopard Shrine (EVI, 44), where in all likelihood⁷⁹ the central motif had been the large panel of two leopards shown face to face on the north wall.⁸⁰ The platform in front of this panel still shows traces of grain offerings as well as statuettes of the standing goddess.⁸¹ Some further support for the appearance of the goddess in animal shape comes from her curious animal (feline?) ears on some of her figures.⁸²

This close relationship with particular animals, apart from her function as goddess of birth, was a common part of a goddess of nature and life, a feature which we find again in the Cretan and Greek goddesses of popular belief, like Demeter and Artemis. She was a goddess of nature, and as such the Anatolian deity most probably governed all aspects of the constantly recurring cycle of birth, marriage and death.⁸³ There is, indeed, some evidence in Çatal Hüyük of this goddess' connection with death and, according to Mellaart, with the vulture, the bird of death.⁸⁴ Still more persuasive evidence comes from the fact that her shrine in Çatal Hüyük was not only the scene of birth but also of death

⁷⁴ It is perhaps somewhat rash to reconstruct from the Anatolian shrines the "pantheon" of Çatal Hüyük "presided over by the mother goddess, her son, and husband – male spirits of fertility symbolized by large and small bulls – and her daughter (or daughters?) younger version(s) of the great goddess herself." Mellaart, A. S. XIV, 47.

⁷⁵ Shrine VII, 23, A. S. XIV, Pl. XIII, a, b.

⁷⁶ AII, 1, A. S. XIII, Pl. XXIV, a–d; fig. 31; 32.

⁷⁷ EVI, 10, A. S. XIV, fig. 9.

⁷⁸ EVI, 8; EVI, 14 (two bulls), A. S. XIII, fig. 8; 18. Cf. VII, 1, A. S. XIV, fig. 14.

⁷⁹ This shrine was badly destroyed by fire, A. S. XIV, 42.

⁸⁰ Ibid. fig. 5.

⁸¹ Ibid. 45; fig. 26.

⁸² EVIB, 45; EVIB, 31; EVI, 10. Mellaart expresses some doubt about the presence and shape of these ears, *ibid.* 47. They could have been part of the goddess' hairstyle, *ibid.* 50, fig. 6, 7, 9.

⁸³ For the part this goddess probably played in a type of hieros gamos ceremony see the stone plaque of a symplegma from House EVI, 30, A. S. XIII, Pl. XXId and fig. 27. Compare this with a stone group from Hacilar showing the same scene – reproduced in Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* Pl. 43a.

⁸⁴ Mellaart – A. S. XIII, 90 – cites the statuette of an old squatting woman found in House EVI, 25 together with a finely carved animal – probably a vulture, Pl. XXII c, d; fig. 26. Cf. A. S. XIV, 64.

and burial. The several murals with vultures attacking normally headless human corpses leave no doubt about the significance of such scenes.⁸⁵

The scenes of death and funeral cult appear generally to have been confined to, and about, the east wall of a shrine, while, as was noticed above, the goddess in the posture of giving birth had her normal place on the opposite, the west wall. Mellaart remarks on this division⁸⁶ which, however, does have exceptions to the rule.⁸⁷ Nevertheless there is abundant evidence that the shrines at Çatal Hüyük⁸⁸ were used for burial grounds. The most usual form was for the human remains to be interred – in a secondary burial – below the east wall of a shrine.⁸⁹ The bones often were buried in random order, although at times an entire undisturbed skeleton was found.⁹⁰ The scenes on the wall – the east wall – above the burial ground, one might reasonably expect, dealt with the subject of death, in such a way, however, that this event was merely considered one aspect – leading once more to birth and life – of the never ending cycle of nature religion. In this belief Çatal Hüyük could hardly have differed signally from other Stone and Bronze Age cultures practising the same beliefs; and the decoration of these walls should reflect features of cult which, even if not always certain in sense and interpretation, might well illuminate parts of the Cretan religious scene.

Some of the most interesting decorations come from the shrines of the Sixth Level. The First Shrine here (EVI, 8) had on its central panel, in the course of its four different phases, a row of three bull's heads, two rows of women's breasts, each concealing the lower jaw of a wild boar, a series of hands, and wall painting depicting flowers, bees or butterflies, and probably chrysalises, over which was painted the design of a honeycomb.⁹¹ The connection between the breasts and birth and life is plain; no less clear is the significance of the boar's jaws within the breasts when compared with the pair of similar breasts on the east wall of the Second Shrine (EVI, 10) which were found to contain the beaks of vultures – the bird of death.⁹² Both breast and jaw or griffin beak, in short, were indicative of birth and death. Their presence fully confirms the symbolic value the artists gave to their work; and they obviously must have a bearing on the meaning of the remaining wall decoration including the bull's heads, the bees, chrysalises, honeycomb and so on.

Beside the pair of breasts on the east wall of the Second Shrine, there recurs the bull's head attached to the wall above a deep niche painted in red and

⁸⁵ See e.g. the so-called Vulture Shrine VII, 8, A. S. XIV, Pl. VII, b; VIII, b; IX, a, b; fig. 20. Cf. Pl. XII a, b; XIV, a; fig. 21; 22. ⁸⁶ A. S. XIII, 79; XIV, 47.

⁸⁷ Cf. for example the figure of the pregnant goddess on the east wall of Shrine VII, 23, A. S. XIV, 66; Pl. XIII a, b.

⁸⁸ As indeed the private houses, certainly in Levels II–VII, A. S. XIII, 95.

⁸⁹ A. S. XIII, 79; 95.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ A. S. XIII, fig. 9–12; Pl. XI, a, b; XII, a–c, p. 67 ff.

⁹² Ibid. 70.

containing some bone tools. In front of this bull, sunk into a platform, was a hole in which were found some scattered human bones.⁹³ The Third Shrine (EVI, 14) merely had a bull's head fixed in the central panel of the east wall, while a niche, surmounted by a ram's head formed the main decoration of the south wall.⁹⁴ The design of the niche and ram's head, side by side this time and flanked in the right panel by a bull's head, is found once more on the east wall of the Fourth Shrine⁹⁵ (EVI, 7). From these few shrines already a definite pattern of decoration emerges, which can be paralleled from shrines of other levels, where the heads of the bull and ram, the very creatures to whom at times on the west walls the goddess is seen to give birth, and a niche – usually painted red – predominate, together with wall paintings featuring human hands, bees, or butterflies, honeycomb etc.

Burial in the shrine gave the worshipper at Çatal Hüyük the promise of life: this is not only symbolically shown by the women's breasts on the walls below which the bones were discovered, but also by the nature of the burial itself, for the bones, as well as the niches, and a number of animal heads, were at times painted with red ochre.⁹⁶ This was a wide-spread and well-known practice of Stone and Bronze Age cultures to denote rebirth from death.⁹⁷ There is no doubt that the murals, the bull and ram crania, and the niche played a vital role in this belief intimately connected with what must have been in essence a chthonic cult of vegetation and fertility.

The frequently recurring niche alone affords a clue to the original location of this type of cult, and serves as a link, so to speak, to an important aspect of Minoan cult which also dated back to the Stone Age. The wall niche, in all likelihood, represented a cave.⁹⁸ Generally it is found on the east wall of the shrines below which the burials occurred: the wall, in fact, most closely associated with death in the cycle of nature. In Greek thought caves were entrances to the underworld. Such natural grottoes were avenues from below to the world of the living at sites like Colonus Hippius, the locality of the Semnae cult, near by the Areopagus in Athens, and the Boeotian Tilphossion.⁹⁹ The same belief probably obtained in Crete concerning caves and natural fissures in the ground, and there is some evidence that this idea was transmitted West from Anatolia, or at least was shared by these Neolithic peoples.¹⁰⁰

⁹³ Ibid. fig. 15; Pl. XIV, a, b, p. 70. ⁹⁴ Ibid. fig. 17. ⁹⁵ Ibid. fig. 16. ⁹⁶ Ibid. 95.

⁹⁷ See R. F. Willetts, *Cretan Cults and Festivals*, London 1962, 56 and refs.

⁹⁸ Cf. Mellaart, A. S. XIII, 79.

⁹⁹ See Dietrich, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 111 f. and n. 1. Cf. the couplet in Euripides, *Electra* 1270 f.

¹⁰⁰ Mellaart, *ibid.* 79 and n. 25, aptly cites a Hattic text – from A. S. IX (1959) 171 ff. – which speaks of the weather god Nerik – in central Anatolia – as disappearing (to the underworld) into a "hole." The motif is common, of course, and probably connected with the idea that the underworld can be entered from the mountains, cf. T. H. Gaster, *Thespis*², New York 1961, 197 f.

The worshipper at Çatal Hüyük still associated the niche in his shrine, and other paraphernalia of his ritual, with a cult which at one time had been celebrated in a cave. Together with fully anthropomorphic statuettes of his goddess, he placed many limestone concretions and stalagmites or stalactites – occasionally partly fashioned to resemble human shape – in the shrine and, as in the Second Shrine of Level VI (EVI, 10), below the ‘cave’ in the wall. A number of similar natural formations have been recovered from caves in the Taurus Mountains to the south of Çatal Hüyük. The Turkish peasants call them *bebek* or “baby”,¹⁰¹ and they clearly were the ancestors of the stalagmitic objects found in many shrines and occasionally in a private house.¹⁰² Shrines of other levels, too, contained such objects; in fact, following the 1963 campaign, Mellaart could categorically state that “the discovery of cult statues is invariably accompanied by a collection of stalactites and concretions”.¹⁰³ The fertility cult, therefore, practised in the domestic shrines of Çatal Hüyük, had at one time – perhaps in full, certainly in its essential parts – been transferred from a cave. Though the locality of the cult may have changed, its form did not relax its curious hold on the mind of the worshipper who, over many generations, retained the aniconic stalagmite as an image of his goddess beside her figure developing to semi-iconic and eventually fully human and naturalistic shape.¹⁰⁴

From the finds at Çatal Hüyük there emerge two points of signal interest to the understanding of Cretan religion. The first concerns the transference of a cave cult, concerned with birth, death, and nature religion in general, to a domestic shrine, and the second consists in the fact that a number, if not all, of the cult statues evolved from the unfashioned limestone concretions, stalagmites and stalactites found in caves. This can only mean that the stalagmites, which enjoyed a special position in religious worship, were in fact aniconic representations of a divinity. That is, far from being symbolic of a particular god or goddess, they, like the subsequent statue, functioned as true images of divinity. The many examples found in shrines and private dwellings make it possible to observe an evolution of these shapes from fully aniconic to semi-iconic and eventual anthropomorphic form. The Second Shrine at Çatal Hüyük alone has yielded examples of all stages which apparently developed from the original limestone concretions.

Such figures vary from the rough stalagmite with sculptured head,¹⁰⁵ to a smoothed stone with superficially carved¹⁰⁶ or incised¹⁰⁷ features, to fully, though schematized, human statuettes¹⁰⁸ whose shape still betrays their origin.

¹⁰¹ A. S. XIII, 82 n. 34.

¹⁰² Ibid. Pl. XIX, b–d; House EVI, 28, Pl. XIX a.

¹⁰³ A. S. XIV, 73.

¹⁰⁴ A. S. XIII, 82. Mellaart, *ibid.*, suggests that the older aniconic or semi-iconic figures might have been examples of “ritual heirlooms.”

¹⁰⁵ A. S. XIII. Pl. XIX b.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. Pl. XIX d.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. Pl. XIX c.

¹⁰⁸ In black lime stone, see *ibid.* fig. 19.

The same shrine also concealed fully developed statues of high artistic merit depicting single or more figures, or even figures associated with animals.¹⁰⁹ Of those representing deities, at least some are male.¹¹⁰ This picture of cult statues was strengthened and verified in the course of the 1963 campaign from discoveries in other shrines, such as the Boar's Head Shrine (VIB, 45), the Leopard Shrine (VIA, 44), and the Second Vulture Shrine (VII, 21) which, beside both the stalagmites and fully developed statuettes, had concretions with carved heads,¹¹¹ as well as roughly moulded figures that still clearly show their origin.¹¹²

Here we have to hand some unequivocal material with a probable bearing on a few aspects of Cretan cave cult, which not only enjoyed a wide dispersion but also endured in certain instances throughout the history of that island. This is not to say that the Minoan cave cult was an import from Anatolia: this type of cult was too wide spread, not only in the Aegean area, but also in Europe from the Stone Age, to elect any one region or people as the first to have made use of a natural abode for themselves and their gods before they learnt the skill of building their own houses.¹¹³ The rich Anatolian finds should help to throw some further light on the more thinly documented Cretan scene, particularly in view of the close ties between the two centres from the Neolithicum. Thus the Anatolian cult, which in all likelihood had once been practised in the caves of the Taurus Mountains, had some features in common with what we know of Cretan practice. Indeed the finds from those Cretan caves, where cult obtained, were rich but hardly open to easy interpretation, consisting in main of pottery sherds, some of oxen-shaped rhyta or jars with scenes of bucrania, horns of consecration, figurines – human and animal –, grain, weapons – including double axes –, some bronze objects, lamps, and occasional cult furniture like libation tables, beside much evidence of sacrifice.¹¹⁴ Cult statues or idols were rare but not entirely absent.¹¹⁵

In spite of the eminent position of cave cult in Cretan belief, its precise nature yet remains a vexing problem, because of the variety of apparently unrelated offerings found there,¹¹⁶ the scarcity of what might be called "Kultbildnisse,"

¹⁰⁹ See *ibid.* Pl. XX, XXI.

¹¹⁰ E.g. *ibid.* Pl. XXI c.

¹¹¹ E.g. A. S. XIV, fig. 28a–c, from House VII, 24; Pl. XVII a.

¹¹² *Ibid.* e.g. fig. 26; 27; 30 a, b (pebble figurine in shape of stalactite with incised features on head from EVI, 10).

¹¹³ Cf. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 53.

¹¹⁴ For detailed lists and discussion see Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 54 ff.

¹¹⁵ This is maintained by Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 58. J. Hazzidakis, for example, found a bronze statuette in a cave west of Tylissos, Tylissos, *Études crétoises*, III, p. 75, cited by Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 58 n. 18. Perhaps the human bronze figurines from the Psychro cave belong here, too, as well as those from the cave at Patso on Mt. Ida, Nilsson, *ibid.* 63; 67.

¹¹⁶ Cf. the different nature of offerings in the shrines at Çatal Hüyük, ranging from bone tools to grain and weapons.

and the fact that it extended over a vast period, sometimes even – with occasional interruptions – enduring into the Christian era. Cult content, therefore, was bound to change, become adapted, or even attached to different deities, as in the cave at Patso on Mt. Ida which in historical times was sacred to Hermes Kranaios.¹¹⁷ At times not only the deity but also the cult were relatively new, as in the case of the famous cave of Zeus on Mt. Ida, where no cult occurred before the Geometric period.¹¹⁸ The uncertainty of our evidence notwithstanding, there is enough to show that cave cult in Crete, too, was concerned with some basic aspects of nature religion namely birth and death. Cretan caves, like the Anatolian shrines, and caves before them from Neolithic times, were commonly used as burial grounds,¹¹⁹ a practice so traditional, in fact, that the cave gave its form to most of the subsequent tombs in Crete and on the mainland.¹²⁰

The event of birth, too, was celebrated in the Cretan cave of which the best example, of course, comes from the famous cave of Eileithyia known to the Homeric poets,¹²¹ and many years ago identified with the grotto discovered at Amnisos by Hazzidakis and Marinatos.¹²² Whatever the etymology of her name¹²³ – and perhaps she was an invocatory name of the Cretan Great Goddess¹²⁴ – Eileithyia was a Minoan goddess of birth¹²⁵ who survived in Greek religion with strong cults in Laconia and on some Aegean islands.¹²⁶ In Greek belief Eileithyia became subordinate to, and often little more than an epithet of, the goddess of wild life and nature Artemis whose title *Lochia* gives testimony of her function as goddess of birth. Eileithyia's cult obviously was concerned with birth, and her close affinity with the Greek Artemis may well prove that she, like her Greek counterpart, was responsible not only for human birth but also that of animals.

¹¹⁷ F. Halbherr, "Scoperti nel santuario di Hermes Craneo", *Mus. di ant. class.* II (1888) 913 ff. Pl. XIV. Cf. the Lynchnospelaion at Parnes on the mainland which belonged to Pan in the fifth cent. B.C., Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 67.

¹¹⁸ Halbherr, "Scavi e trovamenti nello antro di Zeus sul Monte Ida," *Mus. di ant. class.* II (1888) 689 ff.

¹¹⁹ J. D. S. Pendlebury, *The Archaeology of Crete*, London 1939, 47; 60; 65. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 54 ff. Cf. Willetts, *op. cit.* (see n. 97) 141 ff.

¹²⁰ See e.g. F. Matz, *Kreta, Mykene, Troja*, Stuttgart 1957, 37; 61; 121.

¹²¹ *Od.* 19, 188.

¹²² For refs. and description see Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1); Willetts, *op. cit.* (see n. 97) 143.

¹²³ On this see Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 519 f. with refs. to other works on the subject.

¹²⁴ Persson, *op. cit.* (see n. 52) 130.

¹²⁵ See especially Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 518 ff.; *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*², Munich 1955, I, 312 ff., on this and the following points.

¹²⁶ Her name also occurs on some Linear B tablets, cited by J. Chadwick and L. Baumbach, "The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary", *Glotta* XLI (1963) 188. Cf. L. R. Palmer, *op. cit.* (see n. 7) 120 f.

There is a good deal of other evidence describing the Cretan cave as a scene of birth. Much of it is late, occasionally from Hellenistic sources, but no less convincing for that, because our authorities quote from ancient religious stock which had survived to their day. The oldest perhaps, and the most significant, comes from that part of Greek myth which tells the story of the birth and nurture of the Divine Child. This kind of myth has been fully discussed elsewhere,¹²⁷ and need not again detain us. The tale of the Divine Infant, normally the youthful *paredros* of the Mother Goddess, as he probably appears on some seals,¹²⁸ his birth, nurture and death, belonged to old Minoan mythology and was shared with other Aegean religions in its essentials. This motif exerted an extraordinarily strong appeal to popular imagination which is reflected in the fact that the birth and death of the youthful male deity – representative of the growth and decay of vegetation – came to be adopted by Greek legend, where it endured in historic times. Greek literature – on which we have to depend for most of our information on the subject – knew several versions of this myth, but they did not differ in their essential points. Zeus as Kretagenes, and probably occasionally as the Minoan Velchanos,¹²⁹ became identified with the Divine Infant¹³⁰ who suffered the annually recurring fate of the *eniautos daimon*.¹³¹

The features common to all versions of the myth, and of importance to our purposes, consisted in the babe's close association with Mother Earth or a Mother Goddess, and his nurture by an animal.¹³² He is said to be born in a Cretan cave;¹³³ and, whatever his name, the stereotyped features of his myth mark him out as a part of Minoan and Aegean tradition of which one may well find a trace even in the Anatolian shrines of Çatal Hüyük. Archaeological evidence to show that one cave saw both the celebration of death and rebirth there is none;¹³⁴ this we may gather from later mythology describing the annual

¹²⁷ See also Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 533–83; *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 315ff.; cf. Willetts, *op. cit.* (see n. 97) 147; 239f.; 250 f.

¹²⁸ E.g. the electrum ring from Mycenae, Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) III, 463f., fig. 324; cf. Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 111; Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* 149f.

¹²⁹ The young Velchanos was pictured on coins from Phaestus, *Cat. of coins in B.M., Crete*, XV, 10.

¹³⁰ On the startling “heterodoxy” of this belief in the annual birth and death of the Greek Zeus see e.g. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 320; Hutchinson, *op. cit.* (see n. 8) 200; Dietrich, *op. cit.* (see n. 4) 18.

¹³¹ An apt phrase, coined, however, for a slightly different context by Miss Harrison, see Dietrich, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) Appendix IV.

¹³² A sacred sow, bitch, a swarm of bees, a cow, or most frequently the goat Amaltheia, see Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 321; cf. L. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*⁴, ed. by Robert, 1887, I, 35 n. 4.

¹³³ Various identified by our Greek sources, Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 320f.

¹³⁴ Indeed some caves, like that at Pyrgos, containing hundreds of interments – Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) I, 59; Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 55; Willetts, *op. cit.* (see n. 97) 142 – appear in time to have been exclusively devoted to burial.

birth of Zeus in the same cave.¹⁸⁵ Furthermore, so far only vague evidence has come to light that the Mother Goddess in Çatal Hüyük had a youthful companion¹⁸⁶ whose precise cultic functions, of course, at present remain obscure. In the absence of contemporary written records this lack is no more than natural, and it is equally painfully felt in the West.

Under these circumstances firm analogies of religious practice between Anatolia and Crete are out of the question. However, we do possess enough knowledge, backed considerably by an appreciation of the cultural ties between East and West, to detect significant correspondences between a cult transferred from caves to a domestic shrine in Çatal Hüyük and the Cretan cave cult which, though it flourished throughout the island's history, also found a place in domestic shrines as in the Little Palace at Knossos. The latter has yielded up not only figures of horns of consecration and the goat, but also limestone concretions, the descendants of the stalagmite, with roughly shaped features not unlike the Anatolian manner.¹⁸⁷ In both localities the scene of the cult was intimately connected with a cave. The nature of the cult dealt with birth and death, in all likelihood symbolic of the annual growth and decay of vegetation. At the centre of this cult was a Great Goddess of nature particularly concerned with birth; a fact vividly portrayed in the shrines at Çatal Hüyük, and explicit in Crete in the figure of Eileithyia at Amnisos. The Cretan goddess "of the cave" was most likely shown by the famous statuette – probably as late as L. M. III – of a woman and child found by Forsdyke in a tomb at Mavro Spelio ("Black Cave"),¹⁸⁸ and similar, incidentally, to a group of a mother holding her child, on a slate plaque from House EVI, 30 at Çatal Hüyük.¹⁸⁹

The Cretan goddess, in her cave, recurs – once with the young god – on a few Cretan seals.¹⁹⁰ This goddess of birth and nature in East and West was closely connected with certain animals; indeed, our pictorial evidence suggests

¹⁸⁵ See the version in Antoninus Liberalis 19. Cf. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 543.

¹⁸⁶ See Mellaart, A. S. XIV, 90.

¹⁸⁷ Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 58; Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 90f. fig. 20; *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 267, Pl. 3, 4.

¹⁸⁸ E. J. Forsdyke, "The Mavro Spelio Cemetery at Knossos", B. S. A. XXVIII, 243. Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) II, 556f. fig. 327, calls her an example of the Minoan Mother Goddess. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 300; 304f., contests this view on the grounds that the figure was late and probably influenced by similar Mycenaean statuettes. This point does not, however, invalidate the significance of the goddess with the child. On this point see also Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 205.

¹⁸⁹ A. S. XIV, fig. 27, Pl. XXI d.

¹⁹⁰ In a scene from an electrum ring from Mycenae, Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) III, fig. 324; and on a clay sealing from Knossos, reproduced in Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* fig. 72 d. Once with a young god, on a signet ring from Thisbe, Evans, *ibid.* fig. 328. This last ring, however, most likely is a forgery: see Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 40f.; *op. cit.* (see n. 125) I, 284 n. 1. These scenes occurred in a cave which the artist represented by stalagmites or stalactites.

that goddess and animal may have been thought of as identical or at least interchangeable. In Çatal Hüyük the goddess gave birth to a bull or ram, animals which were also fully represented by their crania or simple horn cores (in the case of the bull) in the shrines, where once a pair of leopards (EVI, 44) may well have replaced the goddess (possibly in twin form). In Crete the same animals¹⁴¹ played a vital role in the cult of this figure. The same ambivalence between anthropomorphic goddess and her animal, reflected in myth, obtained and must account for the goat's position as the fostermother suckling the babe, depicted once on a seal impression from Knossos.¹⁴² The goat, perhaps, shown within a cave on another sealing from Knossos,¹⁴³ may have taken the goddess' place. Equally common to the Minoan cave sanctuary was the bull, that is generally the so-called horns of consecration which were found among the deposits, for example, in the cave at Patso,¹⁴⁴ and which figured on the sealing from Knossos mentioned above,¹⁴⁵ and formed the central motif on the bronze tablet (perhaps L. M. I) from the cave at Psychro.¹⁴⁶

Most valuable, because no ambiguity attaches to it, is the functional correspondence between the Anatolian limestone concretions and stalagmites, and those found in many Cretan caves where cult obtained. Two significant points were noted above¹⁴⁷ which concern the nature of the Anatolian stalagmites as cult idols, and the fact that from them, stage by stage, developed the fully anthropomorphic idols in such a way that the ancient concretions, which harboured divine powers from the earliest days of the cult, never lost their efficacy, but were preserved and revered beside the human statuettes. In Minoan cave cult, too, stalagmites were objects of worship: in fact, in many instances, they seemed to form its centre.¹⁴⁸ Our best examples again come from Eileithyia's cave at Amnisos and the cave at Psychro. The former had, among others, one large stalagmite occupying a central position in cult, for it was surrounded by a wall, and in front of it had been placed a quadrangular stone (altar?).¹⁴⁹ In the lower part of the double cave at Psychro – which,

¹⁴¹ Except that the goat, presumably for ecological reasons (see n. 53), replaced the ram.

¹⁴² Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) III, fig. 326. Evans calls the animal a sheep. The boy sitting beneath the goat, especially when compared with similar groups, makes the nature of this scene obvious, although, as Nilsson remarks (*op. cit.* (see n. 125) 321), the animal is not actually shown as suckling the infant.

¹⁴³ With stalagmites, reproduced in Matz, *op. cit.* (see n. 120) Pl. 54.

¹⁴⁴ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 67. Cf. the bucrania and ox-shaped rhyta discovered in the Psychro cave, *ibid.* 63.

¹⁴⁵ See n. 140.

¹⁴⁶ Reproduced in Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 125) Pl. 7, 3; cf. Willetts, *op. cit.* (see n. 97) 145f.

¹⁴⁷ See above p. 429.

¹⁴⁸ This was not invariably true. At least Zeus' cave on Mt. Ida – Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 64f. – had neither stalagmites nor stalactites. This cave, however, did not see cult before the Geometric period. Cf. Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 58.

¹⁴⁹ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 58, fig. 12.

judging from the remains, was frequented from M. M. – a number of stalagmite pillars were discovered whose cultic importance appears from the numerous bronze objects placed in their vertical crevices.¹⁵¹

These examples have long suggested the sacred nature of such concretions,¹⁵² but their precise import could only be guessed at. Now their position in the Anatolian cult at Çatal Hüyük does clearly demonstrate that the stalagmite was no symbolic representation of divinity or divine power, but an aniconic figure of the goddess who, in all likelihood, controlled growth and the cycle of birth and death. On this point we may now be more definite than was possible for Nilsson some fifteen years ago,¹⁵³ whatever the changes that affected the cult in the passage of centuries before the historic age. It would nevertheless be rash to trace from the Cretan remains a similar development from the rough limestone concretion to the fully anthropomorphic figure. With one or two exceptions – like the semi-human concretions in the Little Palace¹⁵⁴ – there seems to lie a gap, only in part to be explained by the poor preservation of sites often subject to plunder, between the crude and fully finished statuette in Crete.

The Cretan caves have yielded a number of clay and bronze figurines of both animals and humans,¹⁵⁵ but, mostly belonging to M. M. and L. M., they were relatively late and, with few exceptions, like the bronze statuette from Psychro,¹⁵⁶ constituted votive figurines rather than cult idols.¹⁵⁷ Altogether the great majority of idols came from the Middle and Late Minoan periods, and they generally belonged to sites other than the cave.¹⁵⁸ What evidence is there, in fact, in favour of a similar evolution in Crete of the anthropomorphic divinity from aniconic and semi-iconic shape? By no means enough to warrant any dogmatic statement in this direction on the strength of the Anatolian development described above. The only figures which could be considered in this context are the semi-iconic – upper half human, lower half cylindrical – bell-shaped idols, particularly from the Shrine of the Double Axes at Knossos and the Shrine at Gournia.¹⁵⁹ All such idols were placed in domestic shrines and

¹⁵¹ Nilsson, *ibid.* 63 f.; Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 200, also mentions the finds of double axes which apparently had been deliberately placed between these pillars.

¹⁵² Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 74; 258. Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 58, speaks of them as “images de la divinité secrète.” ¹⁵³ *Op. cit.* (see n. 1) e.g. 73. ¹⁵⁴ See above p. 402 f.

¹⁵⁵ E.g. from Tylissos, see n. 115, from Psychro, Phaneromi, as well as clay figurines from Patso, Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 60; 62 f.; 67.

¹⁵⁶ Nilsson, *ibid.* 295, states his strong reservations here, too.

¹⁵⁷ We do not know, of course, whether cave cult in Anatolia existed contemporaneously with the domestic shrines at Çatal Hüyük, and if so, whether such caves contained cult images beside the stalagmites and stalactites.

¹⁵⁸ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 295, divides them into three classes according to the sites where they were discovered: votive figurines from sanctuaries, from shrines – usually cult idols –, and figurines from tombs. Cf. Willetts, *op. cit.* (see n. 97) 58.

¹⁵⁹ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 80 ff. and fig. 14.

therefore did not occur before M. M.¹⁶⁰ In spite of their pillar-like lower part, it is naturally impossible to suggest that these bell-shaped idols should necessarily be considered an intermediate stage between aniconic and iconic shape. They did, however, clearly belong to a religious tradition which greatly antedated M. M.,¹⁶¹ and they therefore illustrate the strong religious conservatism which, as in the East, often placed them beside fully developed idols.

Yet Crete apparently possessed no obvious examples of a transitional period: the crude was side by side the fully developed.¹⁶² Thus, on the one hand, the roughly modelled concretions in the Little Palace intimate that the aniconic goddess had altered little when she came to be associated with domestic cult. Conversely the artists of the best and late Minoan periods conceived her in anthropomorphic form, receiving cult in her cave sanctuary.¹⁶³ Perhaps the Cretans forbore to observe each stage of a laborious development of their plastic art, because as early as E. M. – the third millennium B.C. – they imported the goddess' figure already in fully anthropomorphic shape from Aegean islands, like the Cyclades, from Egypt, and eventually perhaps from Anatolia.¹⁶⁴ Beyond this we cannot go, and it is as well to state here that our information is not enough to establish with any degree of certainty the extent to which this cave cult of a goddess of birth and the cycle of nature survived in its original form.

These few points just mentioned explain that a comparative study of Neolithic Anatolian and Minoan idols is not likely to advance our knowledge on the last issue, because with common beginnings, and these are worth noting, a Cretan goddess of nature found her own form at the peak of the island's culture. The discovery of the shrines at Çatal Hüyük is of more immediate service to that type of Cretan cult concerned with the natural cycle of birth and death, a cult, we know, which certainly was observed in the cave sanctuary, and which formed an important part of the Minoan religious scene, for it endured for many generations leaving its mark on historic Greek thought. We may also reasonably suppose that this cult found other sites of worship outside the cave; and it may well be that dominant figures in Minoan religion, like the bull and, for example, the so-called Mistress of Animals had their first home here, or at least derived from cave cult.

The bull's important position in the Anatolian shrines is strong evidence firstly that in Crete, too, this animal was involved in cult, and that the latter

¹⁶⁰ Nilsson, *ibid.* 316; 321.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Nilsson, *ibid.* 80.

¹⁶² Cf. Nilsson, *ibid.* 293; Matz, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) e.g. 68.

¹⁶³ See the rings and sealings mentioned above n. 138; n. 140.

¹⁶⁴ On the discussions of the Neolithic idols in Crete, their part in cult, and their origins, see especially Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) I, 51 f.; Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 289 ff.; Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 123 f., who discusses some of the vast modern literature on the subject.

could be represented either by the head or simply by the horn cores.¹⁶⁵ This has to be firmly established before investigating the significance of the bull's ubiquitous presence in the shrines of Çatal Hüyük and in the whole range of Cretan cult from the cave to the domestic shrine to the open area of the palace.¹⁶⁶ The shrines at Çatal Hüyük do not obviously show that the bull by itself was thought of as a god, so that there is no hope of further information from this source to resolve the discussion about the existence of a Minoan bull god, identified at times with the Minotaur in Greek legend, or even with the sun.¹⁶⁷

More serious perhaps is the lack of any clear connection at Çatal Hüyük between the bull and the double axe,¹⁶⁸ in view of the two facts that the axe and the horns, crania or entire bull are found so commonly together in Crete,¹⁶⁹ and secondly that the *labrys*¹⁷⁰ – the axe – itself in all likelihood derived from the East.¹⁷¹

Bull cult enjoyed great popularity in the Near East and in the West from Neolithic times;¹⁷² the bull was important enough in Anatolia to lend his name to the Taurus and Antitaurus mountain ranges.¹⁷³ The nature of his cult – and this is well-known – was connected quite generally with vegetation and fertility. In Greek mythology, as Mellaart also points out,¹⁷⁴ this connection was

¹⁶⁵ This is doubted by Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 232. Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* 157, believes that the bullcrania and horns, representing the whole animal, had already been separately brought to Crete during the Neolithikum.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. the large pair near the south entrance of the palace of Knossos, Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) II, 160, fig. 81.

¹⁶⁷ The last theory probably owed its origin to A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, Cambridge 1914, I, 497ff., but found some echoes in later works, including Persson, *op. cit.* (see n. 52) 132; Willetts, *op. cit.* (see n. 97) 111; cf. L. Malten, "Der Stier im Kult und mythischen Bild," *Archäologisches Jahrbuch XLIII* (1928) 90ff. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 231f.; 373, briefly examines and rejects the evidence concerning a Cretan bull-god. For further literature on the subject see Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 199.

¹⁶⁸ So far the double axe appears only once, in a wall painting in House AVI, 6, A. S. XIII, Pl. VIII, b, and not obviously connected with the bull.

¹⁶⁹ G. Glotz, *La Civilisation Egéene* (new ed. ed. by C. Picard and P. Demargne), Paris 1952, 270, speaks of the axe as the fetish of the bull cult. Nilsson's explanation, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) e.g. 229, that the double axe merely entered cult by virtue of its use as an instrument of sacrifice loses force in view mainly of the frequent and curious combination in Minoan art of axe with the branch of a tree or even a "sacral knot" as handle. Some examples of such combinations are conveniently collected by Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* fig. 80; 88; 91 a-c.

¹⁷⁰ A Carian or Lydian word, see e.g. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 223ff.; cf. n. 66 above.

¹⁷¹ For the wide-spread motif of the double axe in the late Neolithic period, see especially Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* fig. 86, 1-3. The latest discussion of the subject can be found in H. G. Buchholz, *Zur Herkunft der kretischen Doppelaxt*, 1959.

¹⁷² See especially Malten's important work, cited above n. 167.

¹⁷³ A. S. XIII, 79.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

reflected by the association of river gods with the bull.¹⁷⁵ More particularly the bull was considered a chthonic animal, and as such was closely related with cave cult. In the Çatal Hüyük shrines, we saw, the bull's head, fixed above or beside the niche in the east wall, portrayed the animal's intimate association with the cave and with the underworld, for the "cave", below which commonly the bones of the dead were buried, was also an entrance to the world below.

In Crete the same held true, for the bull was an important part of cave cult, where he had a function to fulfil in connection with the growth of vegetation,¹⁷⁶ and, we may assume, from the nature of cave cult, with death as well. Small wonder, then, that the bull occurs on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus in the scene depicting a cult of the dead;¹⁷⁷ nor is it out of the way to see in the famous Cretan bull games more than a "secular sport",¹⁷⁸ but a religious rite which, it has been suggested, formed a part of a *drame chthonien*.¹⁷⁹ Picard cites Greek parallels to support his view which, indeed, finds strength from the clearly chthonic nature of the animal in East and West. In fact, Mellaart's Anatolian discoveries impart the feeling that one is on the threshold to an accurate perception of the Minoan bull's cultic role. The bull, it is true, to Cretans was a sacrificial victim,¹⁸⁰ an argument used against the belief in his sacred nature;¹⁸¹ but he figured in a cult of the dead¹⁸² and until we understand the import of the sacrificial scenes – associated with a cult of the dead¹⁸³ – we are compelled to reserve judgment on their significance in cult.¹⁸⁴

Consider, for example, the bull's near relationship with the goddess in the East: the goddess of birth, often his own mother. The bull in Çatal Hüyük was not only shown at the moment of birth, but also as a chthonic animal connected with the dead. The cult here and, we believe, in the Cretan cave dealt with the natural cycle of life and death which, in a particular form, survived in Greek myth. What was the significance of the intimate connection between the goddess and her animal, particularly the bull? May we suggest that the bull, like the goddess' male consort, was born and died every year? There is at present no proof, of course, of such a conjecture, but the bull's connection with the

¹⁷⁵ Poseidon's association with the bull, perhaps in Ionia originally, was due to the same reasons, cf. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 450; Schachermeyr, *Poseidon und die Entstehung des griechischen Götterglaubens*, Munich 1950, e.g. 45 f.; 75.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. the tablet from Psychro, showing the horns of consecration together with branches of the tree – see above n. 146. ¹⁷⁷ Matz, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 403 f.

¹⁷⁸ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 374.

¹⁷⁹ Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 144.

¹⁸⁰ See e.g. the sealstone in the Candia museum, reproduced by Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 230, fig. 113.

¹⁸¹ See especially Nilsson, *ibid.* e.g. 229 f.; 373 etc.

¹⁸² In addition to the scene on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus, see the figure of the bull, together with horns of consecration, on the larnax from Episkopi, Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 434; fig. 197.

¹⁸³ Nilsson, *ibid.* 434 f.

¹⁸⁴ Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* 158, speaks of the bull's "ungezügelter und feindlicher Dämonenkraft" which was to be tamed by the sacrifice of the beast.

Divine Child survived strong in Greek tradition. This was the case with the youthful Zeus, mentioned above, who, identified with the Cretan Velchanos, figured on coins from Phaestus and Gortyn together with a bird and the bull.¹⁸⁵ The most striking example of the connection or identification of the bull with the male child and companion of a Great Goddess of nature was, of course, Dionysus. Whatever his country of origin,¹⁸⁶ to the Greeks he frequently appeared as tauromorphic¹⁸⁷ and his history, preserved in Greek legend, was typically that of the male child and Mother Nature's companion who symbolised the growth and death of vegetation.¹⁸⁸

The bull, thus, was a part of the Mother Goddess; her son, in a tradition which in all likelihood survived in Greek religion. His cult was primarily concerned with death, but also probably with birth, and occurred, for the reasons discussed above, in the cave, his cultic rather than natural home.¹⁸⁹ The vivid scenes of birth in the Anatolian shrines make it plain above all that there was thought to exist not merely an affinity between the goddess and her animal, but that they might have been identified in such a way that the animal, such as bull or leopard, might have represented or given their shape to her. This is a valuable point, and a hint of proof that the same relationship existed in the case of a particular and common aspect of the nature goddess in Crete and Greece whom Studniczka gave the Homeric title of *Potnia Theron*.¹⁹⁰ The bonds, though, which united goddess and animal were closer than those of a mistress and her servant.¹⁹¹

The monstrous Mother Goddess from Shrine AII, 1, shown on her imperial throne in the act of giving birth, was not merely the mistress of the two feline

¹⁸⁵ Such coins are reproduced in Cook, *op. cit.* (see n. 167) I, 527ff., fig. 391-400; II (1925), 946, fig. 838-41, with sources.

¹⁸⁶ Perhaps the East - Phrygia, cf. Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 568. His cult in the West was of long standing, however, for the god was known to the Mycenaeans at Pylos, Chadwick and Baumbach, *op. cit.* (see n. 126) 186, and may well have been worshipped by the Minoans, Matz, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 67.

¹⁸⁷ In Thespieae; IG VII, 1787; Bull. Corr. Hell. L (1926) 393 and n. 4; Elis: Plutarch, *quaest. graec.* 36, 229 A. Cf. Athenaeus, XI, 476 A; Lycophron, V, 209; V, 1237 with schol.; Euripides, *Bacchae* 100; Sophocles, frag. 782 in Strabo, XV, 687. Later images of the god commonly showed him with the horns of the bull: Plutarch, *Is. et Os.* 364 F; Cornutus, *Theol. XXX*, 59 (Lang).

¹⁸⁸ Semele, his mother, signified Earth. This correct etymology was first proposed by Kretschmer, cited by Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen*, Leipzig 1906, 259; cf. *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 568, "Diese Etymologie des Namens der Mutter des Dionysos ist sicher." Immediately after birth the young god was nurtured by nymphs, Nilsson, *ibid.*

¹⁸⁹ This last point was suggested by Mellaart, *A. S. XIII*, 79.

¹⁹⁰ F. Studniczka, *Kyrene*, 1890, 153ff.

¹⁹¹ The Cretan Potnios Theron, Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 309, is analogous to the male figure - youthful or bearded - shown riding a leopard or bull in statuettes from Çatal Hüyük, *A. S. XIII*, fig. 21, 22.

creatures (leopards?) on whose heads she rests her hands and whose long tails curl up over her shoulders.¹⁹² she was identified with her animals in the same way as the two related great goddesses of nature in Greek belief, Demeter and particularly Artemis,¹⁹³ who at one time did deceive worship in animal form.¹⁹⁴ The precise relationship between deity and animal in both East and West is still far from clear; one cannot yet safely claim identical functions for the so-called *Potnia Theron* and the Boeotian or Arcadian Demeter or Artemis Kallisto. Nonetheless the Anatolian evidence does support the reasonable hypothesis that at least one important aspect of a goddess of nature and vegetation in these cultures consisted in the intimate alliance with her animals, whether these might be the bull, lion, ram or goat, or even bird and snake. Unsolved at present remains the question whether the goddess and her animal were essentially one and the same figure, or if she was thought to be attended by a companion. We have seen evidence to favour both beliefs. To this we may add, on the one hand, the numerous figurines and representations of half-animal half-human hybrids, like the statuette from the Patso cave of a bronze animal with a human head.¹⁹⁵ These mixtures, however, generally were classed among the Minoan daemons¹⁹⁶ who held an uncertain position in cult, where they functioned as servants rather than deities in their own right.¹⁹⁷

More persuasive are the many examples of animals embodying the Minoan goddess and shown on her head or about her: she was thought to appear to her worshippers in animal form. The most common epiphany of the deity was in the shape of a bird.¹⁹⁸ But the goddess also appeared as snake,¹⁹⁹ and significantly, we see from one statuette from the eastern repository of the Central Palace Sanctuary at Knossos, in the form of a leopard.²⁰⁰ On the other hand, in many instances in Cretan art the goddess may have been accompanied by her animal.²⁰¹ In this way perhaps we should interpret the frequent so-called heraldic scenes on Cretan gems depicting a goddess²⁰² flanked by, or grasping,

¹⁹² Ibid. Pl. XXIV, a-d; fig. 31, 32.

¹⁹³ See e.g. Nilsson, op. cit. (see n. 125) 214.

¹⁹⁴ Nilsson, ibid. 214.

¹⁹⁵ Museo di ant. class. II (1888), Pl. XIV, 8.

¹⁹⁶ Examples are collected and discussed by Nilsson, op. cit. (see n. 1) 374 ff. and n. 16.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Dietrich, op. cit. (see n. 37) 16f. Nilsson, op. cit. (see n. 125) 297, calls them "Geschöpfe eines von Fieber überhitzten Gehirns."

¹⁹⁸ Nilsson, op. cit. (see n. 1) 330 ff.; Matz, op. cit. (see n. 37) 397.

¹⁹⁹ Nilsson, ibid. e.g. 332; 340.

²⁰⁰ Evans, op. cit. (see n. 2) I, 501 ff.; fig. 360 a, b; 361; 362 a-d. Although the animal on the head of the goddess has the clear markings of a "spotted leopard," Evans sees in her a lioness. This statuette is smaller than the main figure of the shrine - fig. 359 - but, contrary to Evans' opinion, represents a goddess by virtue of the headdress, cf. Nilsson, op. cit. (see n. 1) 86.

²⁰¹ Picard, op. cit. (see n. 37) 112, in fact supposes that this, too, was the function of the birds shown together with the goddess.

²⁰² Occasionally a male figure, the Potnios.

animals.³⁰³ Two common motifs in this connection show the deity either standing beside her animal or riding it,³⁰⁴ similar, in fact, to a number of representations from Çatal Hüyük.³⁰⁵

Such evidence in East and West makes it impossible to answer conclusively the exact function of the goddess' animal in cult. Perhaps the answer is that no clear distinction was felt to exist between deity and animal. The Anatolian scenes appear to point to such an ambivalence of concept: certainly, in spite of the gap of time, they cast some light not only on the nature of the so-called Mistress of Animals, but also on the type of cult from which she probably arose.³⁰⁶

It remains to mention the honeycomb pattern, butterflies and chrysalises painted on the east wall of the First Shrine (first and second phase) in Level VI at Çatal Hüyük (EVI, 8)³⁰⁷. These designs raise two points of interest: firstly the apparent connection of the bee and butterfly, two insects whose life cycles from closed cell to bee, and from chrysalis to fully grown butterfly seem to be portrayed here.³⁰⁸ The second point concerns the part these scenes played in the ritual or myth of the cult. The development from lifeless cell or chrysalis to the insect imaginatively depicts the interconnection between life and death, the birth of one from the other, so that we are not surprised to find the paintings on the east wall of the shrine with its symbolism of death and the underworld described above. In Minoan and Greek belief, too, the bee was associated with life and death, and Mellaart cites some examples of this belief,³⁰⁹

³⁰³ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 357 ff. and figs. 168–74, and the famous seal of the "Mother of the Mountains" from Knossos, fig. 162.

³⁰⁴ See e.g. the sealings from the Temple Repositories at Knossos, Evans, *op. cit.* (see n. 2) I, fig. 363 a–c; Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) figs. 163–65. The riding goddess occurs on a lentoid gem from Chalkedon, found near Mycenae in Clytemnestra's tomb, Mylonas, *Ancient Mycenae*, 1957, 95 fig. 35; Bull. Corr. Hell. LXXXI (1957) 215, 34; on a glass plaque from Dendra – Midea, Persson, *Dendra* (1926), 65, 43 Pl. 25; cf. *op. cit.* (see n. 52) 133 fig. 24; and on sealings from Hagia Triada, B. S. A. XLVIII (1953) 86 n. 5, reproduced in Matz, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) fig. 22.

³⁰⁵ A. S. XIII, fig. 21; 22; 23; 24; Pl. XX c; XXI a, b; A. S. XIV, Pl. XV c, d; fig. 29; 32.

³⁰⁶ It may well be that the myth of Europa and the bull was born from this association of a Mother Goddess and her companion in the shape of a bull. Persson, *op. cit.* (see n. 52) 132 f., the association of Heaven or Sun and Moon apart, already saw the essential nature of the bull – Zeus in this legend; cf. Willets, *op. cit.* (see n. 97) 110 f. The concept of the riding goddess in Greek belief was not, however, confined to Europa, but recurs in the case of Aphrodite Ehippus and Epitragia, and deserves, together with the concept of the often youthful Potnios, a separate treatment. For the riding Aphrodite see Dietrich, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 106 n. 3. Noteworthy in the representations of "Europa" – see above p. 394 and n. 72 – is the attitude of her arms, which was identified above as a "Segnungsgestus", although Matz, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 416, sees in it the sign of the goddess' epiphany.

³⁰⁷ A. S. XIII, Pl. XII a–c; XI b; fig. 11; 12.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 80.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 80 f.

of which the most striking is the ancient tale²¹⁰ of the nurture of the infant Zeus by bees in a Cretan cave.²¹¹

An interesting parallel of the connection between bees and the annually born male infant, symbol of vegetation, comes from the myth of the Hittite god Telepinu who was thought to disappear each year to be found again by the bee.²¹² Conversely honey and honey cakes were widely used as offerings in the cult of the dead in classical times, while the custom of burial in honey was widespread in pre-historic times in both East and West.²¹³ Further hints of the part played by the bee in this kind of belief can be found in the cults of Artemis of Ephesus and Demeter whose priestesses sometimes were bees.²¹⁴ Again the juxtaposition of life and death is suggested by the fine gold pendant from a tomb at Chrysolakkos, Mallia,²¹⁵ showing two bees holding a honeycomb, as well as from the design of butterflies and probably chrysalises on the gold leaves discovered in the Shaft Graves at Mycenae.²¹⁶ The Anatolian finds, therefore, are exciting because they connect the bee and butterfly in a cult concerned with the dead, and because they may help to reopen discussion – temporally laid to rest by Nilsson – on the existence of such a cult and the part played in it by the butterfly and bee in Cretan and Mycenaean religion.

There is, of course, no evidence in Crete and Mycenae linking butterfly with bee, but this we may gather from the fact that in Greek and quite generally in Aegean belief both insects, like the snake, represented the dead or perhaps, as Picard and others believe, the soul of the dead.²¹⁷ Often, indeed, intentionally or not, the Minoan artist did not make himself clear when he fashioned or engraved on rings, disks or scales an insect whose species could puzzle the entomologist.²¹⁸ Perhaps the precise species was of less concern to the artist

²¹⁰ Although we have it recorded as late as Antoninus Liberalis 19.

²¹¹ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 543; *op. cit.* (see n. 125) 321.

²¹² Cited by Picard, *op. cit.* (see n. 37) 230.

²¹³ Cf. the fate of Minos' son, Glaukos, who drowned in a jar of honey, Persson, *op. cit.* (see n. 52) 12; 14f. with refs.

²¹⁴ J. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, repr. of third ed., New York 1955, 442, with other examples. The chorus in Euripides, *Hippolytus* compares Aphrodite with the bee when she gives death to Semele, 1. 563. A. B. Cook, "The Bee in Greek Mythology," *J. H. S.* XV. (1895) 1 ff., has fully treated this subject.

²¹⁵ Beautifully reproduced in Schachermeyr, *Die min. Kult.* Pl. 39 a.

²¹⁶ See Matz, *op. cit.* (see n. 120) Pl. 91. These small disks were sewn or stuck on to the garments of the dead of both sexes – Matz, *ibid.* 128. Add to these the six bees of gold foil used to adorn a burial gown, and found in 1962 by Marinatos in Peristeria, near Pylos, – cited by Zafropulo, *op. cit.* (see n. 7) n. 121. Zafropulo enthusiastically identifies the omphalos and its design at Delphi with a beehive and honeycomb, and he believes that the tholos tombs in Greece owed their shape to the fact that "distinguished persons had themselves buried – as their god was buried – in beehive tombs etc.," *ibid.* 40.

²¹⁷ *Op. cit.* (see n. 37) 214.

²¹⁸ A good example of this difficulty occurs on the Ring of Nestor-Evans, *J. H. S.* XLV (1925) 55, fig. 47; *op. cit.* (see n. 2) II, 482f. and fig. 289; III, 145ff. fig. 95ff.; *The Earlier*

than the fact that the butterfly, bee, or similar creature, symbolised the rebirth from death, like Aristaeus' swarm of bees which miraculously appeared from the carcass of a bullock.²¹⁹

Now, since Schliemann and Evans,²²⁰ the butterfly, discovered on grave adornments described above, has frequently been identified with the soul of the dead on analogy with modern Cretan folklore. Moreover some gold models of balances with a butterfly engraved on each scale, which were recovered from the Third Shaft Grave at Mycenae, have been cited as examples of a Minoan and Mycenaean belief in a *psychostasia*.²²¹ Butterflies occur frequently in Cretan art,²²² but they do not, as Nilsson points out,²²³ obviously refer to a cult of the dead. The single exception so far seems to be the ring of Nestor²²⁴ which, however, is of doubtful authenticity. Again we may hesitate to accept that the Minoan or Mycenaean believed in the existence of the soul, a concept which developed relatively late in Greek thought; and it must be remembered that Aristotle was the first authority to use the word ψυχή in the sense of butterfly or moth.²²⁵

There is not much weight, then, in an identification of soul with butterfly in Bronze Age Crete. Nilsson suggests²²⁶ that the association of butterfly and soul or spirit of the dead arose not before the sixth century B.C., and then from the prevalent idea that the *eidolon* perhaps of the dead was represented as any winged creature. We may suppose, however, that, prior to this time, the bee and butterfly stood in some relationship to the dead in a belief which traced back for many generations. Such insects, as well as chrysalises and honeycomb, in burial gifts cannot always be accounted for as articles of use:²²⁷ occasionally their religious import is apparent. The key to their probable meaning, and this was already noticed by Evans,²²⁸ lies in the presence of the *pupae* from which the insects were destined to be born.²²⁹

Religion of Greece in the Light of Cretan Discoveries (Frazer Lect., London 1931) 26 ff. and figs. 8–11. The upper left span of the ring shows two female figures in conversation, above whom float chrysalises and insects identified for Evans as butterflies by an entomologist, and for Nilsson – op. cit. (see n. 1) 45 f. – as hymenoptera by another. The creatures are larger than life, and the untrained observer could easily describe them as bees.

²¹⁹ Virg., Georg. IV, 281 ff. Zafropulo, op. cit. (see n. 7) 40, believes that bees and bulls were associated at least as early as the Middle Bronze Age.

²²⁰ H. Schliemann, Mykenae, repr. Darmstadt 1964, 193; 229; Evans, op. cit. (see n. 2) III, 151 f.; cf. op. cit. (see n. 218) 28.

²²¹ These were discussed, with references, in "The Judgment of Zeus," Rheinisches Museum, N. F. CVII, 2 (1964) 121 f. and notes.

²²² The best examples are collected by Evans, *ibid*.

²²³ Op. cit. (see n. 125) 198; cf. *Opuscula Selecta*, Lund 1951, I, 451.

²²⁴ See n. 218, and cf. Nilsson, op. cit. (see n. 1) 43 ff.; op. cit. (see n. 125) 198.

²²⁵ Hist. Anim. 551^a 14.

²²⁶ Op. cit. (see n. 1) 47 and n. 44.

²²⁷ See the discussion in the article cited above n. 221.

²²⁸ See above n. 220.

²²⁹ See e.g. fig. 101 in Evans, op. cit. (see n. 2) III, 150.

These *pupae* or chrysalises, as we remarked above, were symbolic of the cycle of life from death. They played no part in any philosophical concept concerned with afterlife, nor did they, in the manner of the Greek Mysteries, express the promise of life after death. The chrysalis and honeycomb presumably rather figured in the type of cult observed in the Anatolian shrines, as in the Cretan caves, and perhaps in some domestic sanctuaries dealing with the eternal cycle of nature. There is no doubt about the significance of the honeycomb pattern, butterflies, chrysalises, etc. in the Anatolian shrine. Their help in interpreting the equivalent symbols in Crete and Mycenae is invaluable: surely the chrysalis or honeycomb in the grave essentially carried the same message as the wall paintings in the shrine at Çatal Hüyük, or the "flower-like" emblem from the same pattern shown affixed to the "charnel houses" at the Anatolian city.²³⁰ Such evidence is proof of the enormous age, well antedating Minoan culture,²³¹ of the symbolic representation of the birth of life from death.²³²

Rhodes University, Grahamstown

B. C. DIETRICH

²³⁰ See the wall painting in House EVI, 1, A. S. XII (1962), Pl. X, a; XIII, Pl. XXVI, a, p. 98.

²³¹ Nilsson, *op. cit.* (see n. 1) 47, says, "I am bound to confess that it would be most astonishing to find this symbolism (the resurgence of life) as early as the Minoan age."

²³² I wish to express my gratitude to Professor T. B. L. Webster who read an earlier draft of this essay and, in addition to giving valuable advice, saved me from some errors of interpretation.



ΟΠΙΑΩΝ, in the "Iliad"

Author(s): G. J. Stagakis

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Sep., 1967, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967), pp. 414-421

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435001>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

ΟΠΑΩΝ, IN THE *Iliad*

Philologists have made the word *ὀπάων* the object of their study. As the results of their studies are surveyed, it becomes apparent that there exists among the philologists no consensus as to what may be considered the nature of the stem of the word,¹ and there is no agreement as to what may be regarded the root from which the stem has been derived.²

The scholars who have sought to elucidate the word *ὀπάων* by the examination of that word within the particular context of the *Iliad*, at least, are in agreement on two things. They agree that (a) the term *ὀπάων* is a term setting forth the relationship of one hero to another³ and (b) the hero described as *ὀπάων* stands in a subordinate, dependent position to that individual whose *ὀπάων* he is.⁴

¹ Cf., L. Doederlein, *Homerisches Glossarium*, vol. II (Erlangen, 1853) p. 260, 856. E. H. Sturtevant, "Original h in Hittite and the Medio - Passive in R," *Language*, IV (1928) p. 164 pa(i). A. F. Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der indo-germanischen Sprachen* (Lemgo, 1833) p. 244 *ὀ-πάων* (sic). K. Brugmann, *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, zweite Bearb., vol. II, erster Teil (Strassburg, 1906) p. 322 *ὀ-πάων*? (sic). J. A. Hartung, *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache*, vol. I (Erlangen, 1832) p. 160 *οπ*. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. II. 1. 1. (München, 1959) p. 719 **ὀπ-*. W. Prellwitz, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, zweite Bearb. (Göttingen, 1905) p. 333 **οπα*. *Id.*, „Hervorhebende Partikeln in der indogermanischen Wortbildung," *Glotta*, XIX (1931) p. 98 *οπι* (+*α*), *ὀπα-*. H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Lief. 15 (Heidelberg, 1965) p. 401 **ὀπά*. F. Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer* (Halle, 1914) p. 250 *ὀπο-*. J. B. Hofmann, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (München, 1950) p. 235 **ὀπάων*. Cf., É. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, 4^e ed. (Heidelberg, 1950) p. 706.

² Cf., Prellwitz (1905) p. 333 **soqā*. Sturtevant, p. 164 PIE** *pajont-*. Hofmann, p. 235 **soquā*. A. Heubeck, „Griech. *βασιλεύς* und das Zeichen Nr. 16 in Linear B", *IGForsch.*, LXIII, zweites Heft (1958) p. 116 **soquayon* to Wz. *sequ/soqu-*. A. Thumb - A. Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, erste Reihe, zweiter Teil, zweite Aufl. (Heidelberg, 1959) p. 334 **soqu-*. E. Bennett, Jr., *Mycenaean Studies* (Madison, 1964). (M. Lejeune, "Sur quelques termes du vocabulaire économique Mycénien") p. 87 **sokwā*. Cf., A. Walde - J. Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol. II (Berlin und Leipzig, 1927) p. 476 „Strittig ist, ob *ὀπάων* ... auf einem **soquā* ... beruhen". Boisacq, p. 706.

³ Prellwitz (1905) p. 333 and Heubeck, p. 116 Gefährte. P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, vol. I (Paris, 1958) p. 20 «compagnon». Liddell and Scott (1961) v. *ὀπάων* comrade in war, *esquire*. R. J. Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1963) v. *ὀπάων* = *θεράπων*. Like *θεράπων*, v. *θεράπων*. H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, vol. II (Hildesheim, 1963) p. 63 comes, Waffenträger. Cf., Bechtel, p. 250.

The first statement is partly true, but the validity of the second statement is questionable. My own study of the use of *ὀπάων*, in the *Iliad*, has led me to the conclusion that the designation of a warrior as the *ὀπάων* of some hero is not indicative of his subordinate position nor of his dependent relation to that hero. On the contrary, the term is reciprocally applied, and the application of *ὀπάων* is restricted to those heroes who also are described as *ἑταῖροι* or *θεράπων-τες*; in the context of the *Iliad*, the terms *ἑταῖρος*, *θεράπων*, and *ὀπάων* are equivalent.

Ὀπάων is infrequently attested in the *Iliad*; it appears exactly six times.⁵ However, the number of attestations of the word that may be used as evidence of independent value must be reduced to five for one of the verses in which the word is found is repeated verbatim elsewhere in the *Iliad*.⁶ The number of attestations of *ὀπάων* is small and this definitely is disadvantageous to the study of the *ὀπάων* relationship for we are not permitted to see the relationship in a large number of contexts and in contexts of varied nature. Besides, we are handicapped in the study of the *ὀπάων* relation by the nature of the testimony: *Ὀπάων* is used as a descriptive term only for three heroes; for Coeranus the *ὀπάων* of Meriones,⁷ and for Phoenix and Meriones the *ὀπάονες* of Peleus and Idomeneus respectively.⁸ To complicate matters, the validity of that evidence has been challenged; doubts have been expressed regarding the statements that Coeranus is the *ὀπάων* of Meriones and that Meriones is the *ὀπάων* of Idomeneus.⁹ The testimony, clearly, is problematic, but some conclusions can be drawn from the evidence, and the manner in which the word *ὀπάων* is used can be indicated.

A step towards the understanding of the *ὀπάων* relation may be taken by considering the relationship of Meriones to Idomeneus. Meriones is the *ὀπάων* of Idomeneus, that is stated on four occasions.¹⁰ But *ὀπάων* is just one of the terms used, in the *Iliad*, to describe a relation of Meriones to Idomeneus. Meriones is called also the *θεράπων* of Idomeneus.¹¹

The right to regard Meriones as the *θεράπων* and the *ὀπάων* of Idomeneus has been questioned. Kuiper, in a paper entitled "De Idomeneo ac Merione,"

⁴ K. Kuiper, "De Idomeneo ac Merione," *Mnemosyne*, nova series, XLVII (1919) p. 45. Krischan, *RE*., XV, 1 (Stuttgart, 1931) col. 1031. E. Wüst, *RE*., XX, 1 (Stuttgart, 1941) col. 407 v. Phoenix (3. Liddell and Scott, v. *ὀπάων*. Cunliffe, *vv.* *ὀπάων*, *θεράπων*).

⁵ T. W. Allen ed., *Homeri Ilias*, vols. II, III (Oxonii e typogr. Clarendoniano, 1931) 7. 165=8. 263, 10. 58, 17. 258. 610, 23. 360. ⁶ *Cf.*, *Ibid.* ⁷ 17. 610.

⁸ Phoenix, 23. 360. *Cf.*, 1. 489, 20. 312. Meriones, 7. 165 f.=8. 263 f., 10. 58 f., 17. 258 f.

⁹ *Cf.*, H. Düntzer, *ΙΑΙΑΣ. Homers Ilias*, drittes Heft, Buch XVII-XXIV (Paderborn, 1866) v. 17. 610 (I have not been able to secure that work). Rev. by H. Eickholt, *Sokrates, Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen*, neue Folge, I (1868) pp. 223-228. Düntzer's view has been adopted by F. R. Franke, ed., *Homers Iliade* (erklärt von J. U. Faesi) dritter Band, sechste Auflage (Berlin, 1886) p. 210, n. 610. Concerning the Meriones - Idomeneus' relationship see Kuiper, p. 45.

¹⁰ *Cf.*, n. 8.

¹¹ 13. 246, 23. 113=23. 124, 23. 528, 23. 860=23. 888.

emphatically states "Merionem non *θεράποντα* Idomenei videri poetae, nec fortasse *δπάων*".¹³ That is a statement which is very relevant to our inquiry, and it deserves the most careful consideration. The evidence on which the statement is based should be determined, and the evidence should be studied.

That which is discovered completely destroys the effectiveness of Kuiper's objection to regard Meriones as an *δπάων* and a *θεράπων* of Idomeneus: Kuiper's statement is prompted by the preconceived notion that the terms *θεράπων* and *δπάων* are indicative of the subordinate position of the hero so designated in relation to his associate.¹³

Meriones is¹ the *θεράπων* and the *δπάων* of Idomeneus. Still, a third term is used to designate the relationship of Meriones to Idomeneus. In a number of passages, Meriones is called *ἐταῖρος*.¹⁴ He is not explicitly described as the *ἐταῖρος* of Idomeneus, but this must be the case. The evidence of the *Iliad* incontestably supports that conclusion: The testimony clearly states that the *θεράπων* of a person is also the *ἐταῖρος* of that person.¹⁵ The *δπάων* Meriones then is the *δπάων* of Idomeneus and also is his *θεράπων* or his *ἐταῖρος*.¹⁶ Several terms are being used, in the *Iliad*, to describe the relationship of Meriones to his associate Idomeneus. This is by no means peculiar to the *δπάων* Meriones. It is true also of the *δπάονες* Coeranus and Phoenix vis-à-vis their associates.

Coeranus, the second of the heroes whom the poet calls *δπάονες*, is met only once, in the *Iliad*. The evidence relative to him is scant, and it is the object of controversy.

In a brief description which the poet gives of Coeranus, he is presented as "Μηριόναο δπάονά θ' ἡνίοχόν τε" "{the} *δπάων* and {the} charioteer of Meriones"¹⁷. The validity of that description has been questioned by Düntzer. Though the text in which the quoted phrase occurs is relatively sound,¹⁸ Düntzer has argued that the phrase must be emended to read "Ἰδομενῆος δπάονά θ' ἡνίοχόν τε" on the ground that (a) Coeranus must be the charioteer of Idomeneus, da nur Idomeneus ... außer ihm (Koiranos) auf dem Wagen stand, and (b) the passage, as it now stands, is conducive to the obscurity of the text.¹⁹ These are the arguments advanced by Düntzer to support his emendation of the text. Are they sufficient to justify the change? His one argument is weak; case after case can be adduced to demonstrate that clarity is not a consistent feature of the *Iliad*.²⁰ There is evidence to support his other argument: Düntzer makes the assumption that a charioteer is the charioteer of that hero

¹³ Kuiper, p. 45.

¹⁴ *Idem*, pp. 45 ff. For a recent view stating the reciprocity of the *therapon* relation see G. Stagakis, "Therapontes and Hetairoi, in the *Iliad*, as Symbols of the Political Structure of the Homeric State," *Historia; Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte*, XV, Heft 4, p. 417.

¹⁵ 13. 249. 476 ff.

¹⁶ *Cf.*, Stagakis, p. 414.

¹⁷ *Idem*, p. 419.

¹⁸ 17. 610.

¹⁹ *Cf.*, *Ibid.* Critical apparatus reads "τ' pro θ' P¹¹¹ corr."

²⁰ *Cf.*, Eickholt, p. 224.

²¹ *Cf.*, 7. 294 f., 24. 334 f.

who appears on the chariot with him. Düntzer is justified in making that assumption. In the context of the *Iliad*, a charioteer is the chariot driver of that warrior who is on the chariot with him.²¹ The *MSS* reading needs to be emended. Coeranus is the charioteer and the *ὄπλων* of Idomeneus.

The quoted phrase can not be considered adequately discussed until the arguments of those scholars who defend the textual reading are also regarded. Eickholt sees no need to defend the reading of the *MSS* by producing other evidence from the *Iliad*. He assumes that the *MSS* reading is correct. He feels, however, that the passage requires some comment, and that he provides with the statement „Nicht die Benutzung eines fremden Wagens, sondern das Eintreten eines anderen Wagenlenkers klärt die etwaigen Bedenken hinlänglich auf“.²² This, the reader will agree, constitutes poor defence of the textual reading. Kuiper also thinks that the reading of the *MSS* is correct, and in defence of the reading he remarks “ut ... legenti videri potest – non enim Idomeneus curru unquam uti solet in Iliade nostra”.²³ Yet, the passage emended, in accordance with practices observed throughout the *Iliad*, does show that Idomeneus did use a chariot.

Coeranus is the charioteer of Idomeneus. In that brief description of Coeranus, a clue is to be found helpful in reconstructing the fuller relationship of Coeranus to his associate Idomeneus; in the *Iliad*, a hero will use as his charioteer a person who is related to him as his *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων*.²⁴ In consistency with that established trend, the *ὄπλων* Coeranus must be regarded also as the *θεράπων* or *ἑταῖρος* of his associate Idomeneus.

The reconstruction of the relationship of Coeranus to Idomeneus reveals one further limitation which the documentation imposes upon us. The ties of the *ὄπλων* to his associate may be incompletely traced by the poet. That practice, however, is not crippling the effort to trace the relations of the *ὄπλωνες*. In the case of Coeranus his relation to Idomeneus has been reconstructed through some clue which the poet has provided. But even though that had been lacking, the relation of Coeranus to his associate could have been established inferentially from the clearly traced relationship of Meriones to Idomeneus.

Phoenix, the last of those whom the poet describes as *ὄπλωνες*, is the *ὄπλων* of Peleus. Phoenix is also labelled as *ἑταῖρος*,²⁵ and the evidence indicates that he is a *θεράπων*.²⁶ True, he is not called explicitly the *θεράπων* or the *ἑταῖρος* of his associate Peleus, but we may infer that this is the case arguing from the clearly established relationships of the *ὄπλωνες* Meriones and Coeranus to their associates.

²¹ Cf., 11. 273=11. 399, 12. 82ff., 16. 737ff.

²² Eickholt, p. 224.

²³ Kuiper, p. 49. Cf., Eitrem, *RE*., XI, 1 (1921) col. 1061 v. Koiranos 4. Krischan, *RE*., XV, 1 (1931) col. 1032 v. Meriones 1. Kroll, *RE*., XV, 1 (1931) col. 1035 v. Meriones 1. Stagakis, p. 413.

²⁴ Cf., Stagakis, pp. 412, 419.

²⁵ 16. 170ff. 196, 19. 305ff. especially 311.

²⁶ Cf., *Ibid.*, and Stagakis, p. 419.

The evidence illustrates that each of the three *ὀπάωνες* named, in the *Iliad*, is the *θεράπων* or the *ἑταῖρος* and the *ὀπάων* of his associate. These facts are important in themselves, but their real value lies in aiding us to get a better understanding of the relationship of the associate vis-à-vis his *ὀπάων*: The hero who is the associate of the *ὀπάων* is the *θεράπων* or the *ἑταῖρος* of his *ὀπάων*, for, in the context of the *Iliad*, the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* relation is a reciprocal relationship.²⁷ But much is desired. For instance, while we know that the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* relationship is reciprocal, we have not established that this is or is not the case with the *ὀπάων* relationship. Further, while we have implied that the *ὀπάων* is a *θεράπων* or *ἑταῖρος*, we have not considered the question of the exact relation between the *ὀπάων* and the *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων* relationships.

Despite the fact that the evidence is scant, it can be demonstrated that the *ὀπάων* relationship is reciprocal. The testimony can be treated in a variety of ways to effect that demonstration. One method of treatment of the testimony available to us is that of studying the *ὀπάων* *qua* charioteer and following up the implications of that study.

Coeranus is the *ὀπάων* and the charioteer of Idomeneus. Certainly, he is not the *ὀπάων* of Idomeneus by virtue of performing the act of charioteering for Idomeneus. The validity of this observation becomes obvious immediately, especially when it is recalled that Idomeneus has also another *ὀπάων* besides his charioteer and *ὀπάων* Coeranus. Should additional evidence be required, the examination of the functions performed by Meriones for Idomeneus or by Phoenix for his associate Peleus sustains the statement that the *ὀπάων* is not the *ὀπάων* of an hero by virtue of being his charioteer. Rather, we must conclude that Idomeneus out of the total number of his *ἑταῖροι* or *θεράποντες* and *ὀπάωνες* employs one as his charioteer. It would be totally unwarranted to restrict this sort of practice to Idomeneus; in fact, we have no reason to think that this practice is peculiar to Idomeneus; any homeric hero, this is a reasonable inference, employs as his charioteer a person who is related to him as his *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων* and *ὀπάων*. Should that conclusion appear strange, it should be remembered that the poet himself not only explicitly describes a charioteer as the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* of his associate but also allows the inference that every charioteer is the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* of the associate.²⁸ Now that knowledge is supplemented by the fact that the charioteer is also the *ὀπάων* of his associate.

The knowledge that this is the practice, in the *Iliad*, is of great value. A particular passage, in the *Vth* Book, establishes the reciprocity of the *ὀπάων* relation, once the passage is clarified with the help of some other information also found in the *Vth* Book, and once it is read with the understanding that the

²⁷ *Idem*, p. 419.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 412 f., 419.

homeric hero employs his *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων* and *ὀπάων* as his charioteer. In that Book, Diomedes is met wreaking havoc among the Trojans. Aeneas is determined to make a stand against him and seeks for some other Trojan to aid him in the task. He searches particularly for Pandarus, and after finding him, among other things, remarks to him: "But come now, take {the} whip and {the} shining reins, and I will dismount in order to fight; or you intercept him (*i.e.* Diomedes) and {the} horses will be my concern".²⁹ Aeneas, obviously, is asking Pandarus to be his charioteer. The objection might be raised that Aeneas is seeking for someone to hold his horses, and that there is no ground to think that this would make Pandarus the charioteer of Aeneas. It can be pointed out that as the Trojan hero Hector, in a different context, proceeds to battle, he takes with him Cebriones who had been his charioteer and leaves behind someone else to tend his horses.³⁰ When Hector is wounded, he is taken back to the chariot, where to use the words of the poet, his horses stood "with {the} charioteer and {the} chariot cunningly wrought".³¹ Aeneas is indeed asking Pandarus to be his charioteer. The words then of Aeneas to Pandarus imply that Pandarus is the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* and the *ὀπάων* of Aeneas.

The two heroes finally decide that the attack against Diomedes will be more effective if both remain on the chariot; it is also resolved that Aeneas drive the horses.³² Aeneas becomes the charioteer of Pandarus. In consistence with the inference that an hero employs his *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων* and *ὀπάων* as his charioteer, Aeneas must be regarded as the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* and the *ὀπάων* of Pandarus. Certainly, the quoted passage interpreted in the light of other information does establish the reciprocity of the *ὀπάων* relation.

The conclusions from the quoted passage and from other related evidence are clear. However, objections may be voiced that too much emphasis is placed on the arrangement worked out between Aeneas and Pandarus which, after all, was deemed necessary by expedience. The reader may demand that more reliable testimony be adduced to demonstrate the reciprocity of the *ὀπάων* relation.

Other testimony is available. To secure that evidence, we are required to engage in a rather detailed examination of the Myrmidon contingent. That group is of some size and the activities of the members are fairly well documented. It is with relative ease that we can trace the efforts of the members to secure charioteers. Achilles, the commander of the contingent, decides to re-enter the fight against the Trojans, following the death of Patroclus. For his charioteer, he employs the hero Automedon.³³ Automedon is the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* of Achilles, that is easily ascertainable.³⁴ Automedon, however, must also be the *ὀπάων* of Achilles, in accordance with the conclusion that an hero

²⁹ 5. 226–228 ἄλλ' ἄγε νῦν μάστιγα καὶ ἥλια σιγαλδόντα | δέξαι, ἐγὼ δ' ἔππων ἀποβήσομαι, ὄφρα μάχωμαι' | >ἦδ' σὺ τόνδε δέδεξο, μελήσουσιν δ' ἔμοι ἔπποι.

³⁰ 12. 91f.

³¹ 14. 431 ἡνίοχόν τε καὶ ἄρματα ποικίλ' ἔχοντες.

³² 5. 229ff.

³³ 19. 395ff., 20. >261>:273, 284, 289, 498.

³⁴ Cf., 16. 865 and Stagakis, p. 419.

employs his *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων* and his *ὀπάων* as his charioteer. The same Automedon had appeared on the scene earlier as the charioteer of Patroclus.³⁵ He was the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* of Patroclus,³⁶ and we can infer that he was also the *ὀπάων* of Patroclus.

The case of Automedon should be studied more closely, for it can throw considerable light on the *ὀπάων* relation. Automedon and his associations illustrate that the *ὀπάων* relationship must not be conceived as an exclusive, as a one to one relationship. This observation based on the study of Automedon is reinforced by the knowledge that the hero Idomeneus considers Meriones and Coeranus as his *ὀπάονες*.

Automedon was the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* and the *ὀπάων* of his *ἑταῖροι* or *θεράποντες* Achilles and Patroclus. But there is no reason to confine Automedon's relationship to only two of his *ἑταῖροι* or *θεράποντες*. The testimony relative to Automedon asserts that Automedon is the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* and the *ὀπάων* of his *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων*, and we must extend that relationship to the sum total of those who are the *ἑταῖροι* or the *θεράποντες* of Automedon; Automedon is the *ὀπάων* of all his *ἑταῖροι* or *θεράποντες*. That inference is warrantable and needs to be made.

The relationship of Automedon to his *ἑταῖροι* or *θεράποντες* is revealing also in this respect. It demonstrates that an *ἑταῖρος* or a *θεράπων* of Automedon *qua* *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων* regards his associate Automedon as his *ὀπάων*. We can not restrict that practice to the associates of Automedon; not a single piece of evidence can be found, in the *Iliad*, which precludes us from formulating the inference that in the group formed by Automedon and his associates, a member *qua* *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων* regards each of his associates as his *ὀπάων*. That implies that Automedon himself, being an *ἑταῖρος* or a *θεράπων*, regards his associates as his *ὀπάονες*. Again, by a different treatment of the testimony, the reciprocity of the *ὀπάων* relation has been established.

The evidence on which the reciprocity of the *ὀπάων* relation is based should be recalled. The springboard for the preceding analysis was provided by the statement that Idomeneus was employing his *ἑταῖρος* or *θεράπων* and *ὀπάων* as his charioteer. There is no evidence invalidating that statement. However, in all fairness to the reader, it must be emphasized that that statement is the object of controversy, and that the analysis which followed has as its starting point the testimony of one single relationship.

There is another approach which we can follow to demonstrate that the *ὀπάων* relationship is reciprocal, and that approach employs the evidence of all three *ὀπάων* relationships. The collective evidence of the three associations demonstrates that the *ὀπάων* of an homeric hero is also the *ἑταῖρος* or the *θεράπων* of that hero. The associate of the *ὀπάων* is, in turn, the *ἑταῖρος* or the

³⁵ Cf., 16. 145 ff. 279. 427. 472 ff. 684. 733. S 864 ff.

³⁶ Cf., Stagakis, pp. 414 f., 419.

θεράπων of his ὀπάων. That statement must not be doubted for there is ample testimony to support it.⁸⁷

The poet, obviously, is saying that each of the two ἑταῖροι or θεράποντες, namely Idomeneus and Peleus, regards an ἑταῖρος or a θεράπων as his ὀπάων. Can it be assumed that the ἑταῖρος or θεράπων Idomeneus or Peleus regards all of his ἑταῖροι or θεράποντες as his ὀπάονες? Can it also be assumed that any ἑταῖρος or θεράπων of Idomeneus or of Peleus regards his associates as his ὀπάονες? An obstacle to such generalization could come into being should it be discovered that the ὀπάων relationship has a gentilic basis or that it is a functional relationship of a type that can neither be reciprocal nor possessed by many individuals. The *Iliad* provides no reason to think that the ὀπάων relationship has a gentilic basis.⁸⁸ Nor is there any basis for thinking that the ὀπάων relationship is a functional relationship specialized and exclusive. In short, there is nothing, in the *Iliad*, to prevent us from generalizing that which has been established about the ὀπάων relationship: Idomeneus does regard two of his ἑταῖροι or θεράποντες as his ὀπάονες. There is no reason to think that this is not true for the sum total of the ἑταῖροι or the θεράποντες of Idomeneus or of Peleus. Idomeneus or Peleus regards each of his ἑταῖροι or θεράποντες as his ὀπάονες. The inference is justified and necessary. But the testimony of the *Iliad* does not require us to restrict that practice to Peleus or to Idomeneus. In fact, we are justified in inferring that that which is established concerning Peleus or Idomeneus *qua* ἑταῖρος or θεράπων is valid, at least, for any ἑταῖρος or θεράπων of Idomeneus or of Peleus. This implies that the ὀπάων of Idomeneus or of Peleus *qua* ἑταῖρος or θεράπων regards his ἑταῖροι or θεράποντες as his ὀπάονες; Idomeneus or Peleus then must be the ὀπάων of his ἑταῖροι or θεράποντες and ὀπάονες; this conclusion which is reasonable and justified clearly states that the ὀπάων relationship is a reciprocal relationship.

Also something else emerges from this analysis. It becomes evident that a number of groups exist, in the homeric society, the members of which are labelled ἑταῖροι or θεράποντες and ὀπάονες. It would be pure disregard of the testimony to restrict that phenomenon only to certain specific ἑταῖρος or θεράπων groups. It can be inferred that in all ἑταῖρος or θεράπων groups a member is an ἑταῖρος or a θεράπων and an ὀπάων. This finally answers the second question which we had asked, namely what is the relation between the ὀπάων and the ἑταῖρος or θεράπων relationships. The three labels are restricted to the same people; the relationships are coextensive. Since the labels are restricted to the same people, and since an hero may be described by the use of any one of these labels, the testimony of the *Iliad* shows that, in the context of the *Iliad*, the labels are regarded as equivalent; an hero is identified as an ἑταῖρος or a θεράπων or an ὀπάων.

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

G. J. STAGAKIS

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* p. 419.

⁸⁸ *Cf.*, Krischan, *RE*., XV, 1 (1931) col. 1031, v. Meriones 1.



The Argive Destruction of Asine

Author(s): Thomas Kelly

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Sep., 1967, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967), pp. 422-431

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435002>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

THE ARGIVE DESTRUCTION OF ASINE

Although we do not know a great deal about specific occurrences in Greece during the eighth century B.C., there are a few events about which we can speak with some assurance. The destruction of Asine by the Argives is one of these. Several writers from later antiquity report that the inhabitants of this small community were forced to leave their home southeast of Nauplia in the Argolid, and that they fled to Messenia. There they built a new town which they also named Asine.¹ A somewhat more detailed account is found in Pausanias,² who reports that the inhabitants of Asine joined the Spartans in an invasion of Argive territory. Together, they ravaged the area, after which the Spartans returned home; the Argives then attacked and destroyed Asine in retaliation. The city, except for a temple of Apollo that was not disturbed, was levelled, and the inhabitants fled in their ships.

If these late references were the only evidence we possessed for the destruction of Asine, it would be tempting to follow Beloch³ and dismiss the whole account as a later attempt to explain the existence of the geographical place name Asine in Messenia. Fortunately, however, the site of Asine in the Argolid has been excavated, and the archaeological evidence confirms, at least in a general sense, the information preserved in the literary tradition, and especially the account which Pausanias gives. Although there are no physical remains to confirm absolutely the violent destruction of the site, the archaeological evidence does reveal that Asine was deserted, and presumably destroyed, late in the eighth century and not re-inhabited until the Hellenistic period. The only remains from the intervening years are those from a temple deposit, associated apparently with the temple of Apollo which Pausanias says was not destroyed by the Argives.⁴

¹ Theopompus, *FGrH* 115 F 383, cf. Strabo 8. 6. 11 (373), seems to be the earliest extant reference, but most of our information comes from Pausanias, 2. 36. 4–5; 3. 7. 4; 4. 8. 3; 4. 34. 6. Herodotus 8. 73 does not specifically state that Messenian Asine was founded from Argive Asine, but he did know that the inhabitants of the former settlement were Dryopes.

² See especially 2. 36. 4–5.

³ *Griechische Geschichte*² I 1 333 with n. 2; I 2 194.

⁴ Otto Frödin and Axel W. Persson, *Asine: Results of the Swedish Excavations 1922–30* (Stockholm, 1938). On the destruction of the site see p. 437; on the temple of Apollo, pp. 148–151. W. S. Barrett, "Bacchylides, Asine, and Apollo Pythaieus," *Hermes* 82 (1954) 426–429, 438–440 has argued that Bacchylides, frag. 4 comes from an ode which was performed at the temple of Apollo at Asine in the first half of the fifth century; this would offer further proof that the temple remained standing after the town was destroyed.

Although generally in harmony with the archaeological evidence, Pausanias' account of the destruction of Asine contains one particular detail, which is confirmed neither by the archaeological evidence nor by any other ancient author. The detail in question concerns the reasons he gives for the destruction of the site. He believed that it was a punitive measure undertaken by the Argives after the Asinaians had aided the Spartans in a war against Argos. It is important to note, moreover, that Pausanias regarded the Spartans as the aggressors in this war; it was they who invaded Argive territory and were successful in ravaging the area.⁵ Although the reason which Pausanias gives for the destruction of Asine has been widely accepted,⁶ it must be remembered that he lived and wrote almost nine hundred years after the events he claims to be describing. As we shall see below his account is not only inconsistent, but also irreconcilable with what little we know of Argive and Spartan history at the approximate time of the alleged war. I hope to show that while he was probably correct in regarding the Argive destruction of Asine as a punitive measure, it was not undertaken for the reason he believed.

Any attempt to ascertain the real motives which prompted the Argives to act will be hampered by a lack of precise dates both for the actual destruction of Asine and for the alleged Spartan invasion of the Argive plain which supposedly led to it. It is fruitless to look for, or expect to find, chronological precision in Pausanias. For example, he states at one point that the Asinaians were expelled from their home in the Argolid a generation before the First Messenian War, but elsewhere he implies that they were given land in Messenia only after the successful conclusion of this war by the Spartans.⁷ Since the war lasted about twenty years, the Asinaians, by Pausanias' account, must have been homeless for nearly fifty years, and this does not seem at all reasonable. His report that it was the Argive king Eratus who attacked and destroyed the site is of no help, as Eratus is otherwise unknown.⁸ By far the most useful chronological information he provides is the statement that it was the Spartan king Nicander who led the invasion against Argos. While we do know that Nicander was king during the First Messenian War, the precise dates of his reign are not

⁵ He makes the point twice, at 2. 36. 4–5, and 3. 7. 4, and these passages are the only references we have for this war. It must be noted, however, that Eusebius records a war between Argos and Sparta in 719/718 B.C. Both Luigi Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche* (Rome, 1962) 10–11, and George L. Huxley, *Early Sparta* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962) 31 believe that this was the same war mentioned by Pausanias.

⁶ I cite only a few recent examples: Huxley, *Early Sparta* 21, 31; W. S. Barrett, *Hermes* 82 (1954) 427–428 with n. 3; Paul Courbin, *La céramique géométrique de l'Argolide* (Paris, 1966) 565. (Hereafter this work will be cited as *CGA*).

⁷ The pertinent passages are 4. 8. 3 and 4. 14. 3. Theopompus, *FGrH* 115 F 383 seems to imply that the Asinaians were driven from their home in the Argolid only after the First Messenian War.

⁸ M. Th. Mitsos, 'Αργολική Προσωπογραφία (Athens, 1952) s.v. "Ἐράτος".

known,⁹ and even if they were, we would not know where within the period of his kingship the alleged invasion occurred. On the basis of the literary evidence alone, all that can be determined is that Sparta invaded Argos and Asine was destroyed sometime in the latter half of the eighth century. Fortunately, there is archaeological evidence which allows us to narrow this date considerably. The latest Geometric pottery found at Asine has recently been dated later than 725 but earlier than 700, perhaps about 715 B.C.,¹⁰ and Asine must have been destroyed about this time. There is no way to determine how long a period of time might have elapsed between the alleged Spartan invasion and the Argive retaliation on Asine, but one would not expect the Argives to wait forever to gain their revenge. If therefore, Pausanias' account of the destruction of Asine is accepted, one is also forced to accept as fact a successful, aggressive Spartan invasion of the Argive plain sometime in the last quarter of the eighth century. There is a body of evidence which suggests that the Spartans were in no position to succeed at such an ambitious undertaking at this time, or for that matter, at any time during the latter half of the eighth century.

We do not, unfortunately, know a great deal about Argive history in the latter half of the eighth century B.C., but the archaeological evidence indicates that Argos was a wealthy and prosperous city in this period; it may even have been the leading state in the Greek world.¹¹ The settlement itself occupied a considerable area in the plain; it probably extended farther to the north and to the east than it did in the archaic period, or even in classical times, although it did not reach so far to the south nor to the west as it did later. It also extended up the slopes of the Aspis, the city's lower acropolis, and spread over part of the old Mycenaean burial ground on the Deiras ridge.¹² This period also marks the high point in the production of painted pottery at Argos; neither before nor after this half century did Argive potters produce finer vases, nor were they ever produced in greater quantity. Almost everywhere that excavation has been undertaken in the modern city, Late Geometric pottery has been found.¹³ Certain tombs dating from this period are very rich in ceramic remains, and the

⁹ On the dates of this war see below.

¹⁰ Courbin, *CGA* 565 with n. 6.

¹¹ Chester G. Starr, *The Origins of Greek Civilization* 1100-650 B.C. (New York, 1961) 347; see also the remarks of Seraphim Charitonides, "Recherches dans le quartier est d'Argos," *BCH* 78 (1954) 409-426, especially 422, 426.

¹² On the size of the settlement in this period see Charitonides, *BCH* 78 (1954) 422-423, and the same author's "Ἀνασκαφαὶ ἐν Ἀργεῖᾳ" *Praktikā* (1952) 413-426; "Chronique des fouilles," *BCH* 77 (1953) 253, 263, and *BCH* 83 (1959) 755-762. On the Deiras ridge see Wilhelm Vollgraff, "Fouilles d'Argos," *BCH* 28 (1904) 364-366.

¹³ The abundance of Late Geometric pottery is stressed in almost every excavation report, but see especially "Chronique des fouilles," *BCH* 83 (1959) 755-762, and Paul Courbin, "Discoveries at Ancient Argos," *Archaeology* 9 (1956) 166-174. On the excellent quality of this pottery see now Courbin, *CGA* 544-549.

most wealthy inhabitants of the city were equipped with bronze armor.¹⁴ There is evidence that this was a period of unprecedented building activity, as several temples, including the Old Temple at the Argive Heraeum, were constructed during this half century.¹⁵ The obvious prosperity of the city of Argos in the latter half of the eighth century indicates that it would have been a formidable opponent. Any invasion of Argive territory during this period would have been a major undertaking, and would have required the undivided attention of the Spartans.

The evidence for Spartan history in the latter half of the eighth century is not abundant. Only limited archaeological material is available, and such literary accounts as we possess are mostly late and generally untrustworthy.¹⁶ A detailed history of the city cannot be written, but we do know that this was a troubled period for the Spartans. Although modern scholars have not been able to reach any agreement on the exact dates of the First Messenian War, it is generally believed that this twenty-year conflict was waged sometime between ca. 740 and ca. 710 B.C.¹⁷ We know, moreover, that the war was not an easy one; the Spartans were victorious, but they were forced to fight long and hard to gain their victory.¹⁸ It is not likely that they could have taken time out from their struggle with the Messenians to invade the Argive plain, and if such

¹⁴ Paul Courbin, "Une tombe géométrique d'Argos," *BCH* 81 (1957) 322–386 has published the finds from a remarkably rich Late Geometric tomb. Amongst other objects found in the tomb was a full suit of bronze armor.

¹⁵ On the Aspis, the lower acropolis of the city, Geometric sherds have been found beneath the terrace wall upon which a temple of Pythian Apollo later stood, and these suggest that some deity was already being worshipped at this site in the latter half of the eighth century; see Wilhelm Vollgraff, *Etudes péloponnésienes I, Le sanctuaire d'Apollon pythéen à Argos* (Paris, 1956) 11, 29. On the Larissa, the higher acropolis, earlier foundations, and a discarded votive deposit containing an abundance of Late Geometric potsherds have been found; see Wilhelm Vollgraff, "Opgravingen te Argos," *Mededelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* 66 (1928) 91–92, and 72 (1932) 72, and see also *BCH* 77 (1954) 314. Courbin, *CGA* 565 with n. 2 dates the earliest pottery from this deposit slightly earlier than the middle of the eighth century. The date of the Argive Heraeum will be discussed below.

¹⁶ Chester G. Starr, "The Credibility of Early Spartan History," *Historia* 16 (1965) 257–272.

¹⁷ On the dates of this war see Franz Kiechle, *Messenische Studien* (Kallmünz Opf., 1959) 9–14; Angelo Brelich, *Guerre, agoni, e culti nella grecia arcaica* (Bonn, 1961) 34–39; W. Den Boer, *Laconian Studies* (Amsterdam, 1954) 48–49; Huxley, *Early Sparta* 34–36. Thomas Lenschau, "Die messenischen Kriege," *Philologus* 91 (1936–37) 298–307 has, however, argued for a date ca. 670–650. Courbin, *CGA* 565 has recently suggested on the strength of Pausanias 4. 8, 3 that the war should be dated to the early seventh century.

¹⁸ We know little about the actual course of the war. Pausanias is our chief source and his account is largely if not entirely legendary; see Felix Jacoby, *FGH* Part III Kommentar 112 ff., and Lionel Pearson, "The Pseudo-History of Messenia and its Authors," *Historia* 11 (1962) 397–426. Tyrtæus, fragment 4 leaves no doubt, however, that the struggle was a lengthy one.

an invasion actually did occur in the latter part of the eighth century, it most likely would have been undertaken after the war with Messenia. Even after the successful conclusion of this war, however, and partly as a result of it, we know that the Spartans were faced with pressing social and political problems which required attention. It is impossible to accept entirely the elaborate accounts found in later writers concerning the troubles which confronted the Spartans at this time,¹⁹ but there is no reason to doubt that there was a good deal of discontent in the city. Conditions did not improve until the Spartans agreed to send the malcontents out to set up the colony of Tarentum, which according to the traditional scheme of dating was founded in 706 B.C.²⁰ The existence of this discontented element in the city would in all probability have made it difficult for the Spartans to unite in an aggressive war against the Argives,²¹ and certainly it would have caused them to think twice before becoming involved in another war so soon after their long conflict with Messenia.

If Pausanias' report of a Spartan invasion of Argive territory in the late eighth century is considered in this context, it has little to recommend it. On the one hand, Argos was a wealthy, prosperous, and populous settlement; the construction of the Argive Heraeum five miles away from the city demonstrates the confidence and assurance with which its leaders were capable of acting. Sparta, on the other hand, was engaged in a twenty-year conflict with Messenia, and after the conclusion of this war had to alleviate social and political discontent at home, and had also to consider the problems raised by the acquisition of new territory. In such circumstances it is difficult to believe that they could have launched a successful, aggressive invasion of the Argive plain, and I for one would like to have more trustworthy evidence than the brief mention of such an invasion in a work written more than eight hundred years after the event.

¹⁹ Our information comes mostly from later writers; Strabo 6. 3. 2 (278); Aristotle, *Politics* 1306b 30; Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 216; Theopompus, *FGrH* 115 F 171. See also Franz Kiechle, *Lakonien und Sparta* (Munich, 1963) 176–183.

²⁰ This date is generally supported by the archaeological evidence. The earliest pottery found at the site probably dates to the early seventh century; see L. Bernabo Brea, "Taranto," *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* 18 (1940) especially p. 483 with figure 49, and cf. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford, 1948) 29–31.

²¹ It might also be noted that even the founding of Tarentum did not, apparently, eliminate all dissatisfaction at Sparta, and internal problems continued to be a major concern in the early part of the seventh century. Although the evidence is far from conclusive the Great Rhetra probably dates from the first half of this century; see Huxley, *Early Sparta* 37–52; Starr, *Historia* 14 (1965) 269–271; W. G. Forrest, "The Date of the Lykourgan Reforms at Sparta," *Phoenix* 17 (1963) 157–179. H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Spartan Rhetra in Plutarch, Lycurgus VI," *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford, 1958) 37–85, however, dates it about the end of the seventh century, while F. Kiechle, *Lakonien und Sparta* (Munich, 1963) 142–162, and Den Boer, *Laconian Studies* 153–196 place it in the first half of the eighth century, and N. G. L. Hammond, "The Lycurgan Reform at Sparta," *JHS* 70 (1950) 42–64 argues for an even earlier date.

It is important to note that relations between Argos and Asine seem never to have been particularly close. All throughout the Dark Ages and even as recently as the Late Geometric period Asine, to judge from the pottery found at the site, seems to have had fully as much contact with far-away Athens as with its nearby neighbor Argos.²² This is not easy to explain, but it may be significant that the inhabitants of Asine were Dryopes not Dorians, and even at a much later date they remained steadfastly proud of their ancient heritage.²³ Moreover, Apollo, not Hera, was the chief divinity of the Asinaians,²⁴ and Hera was never worshipped in their city. Even with these differences between them, however, the Asinaians and the Argives, so far as we know, remained on peaceful if not exactly friendly terms all throughout the Dark Ages. The question which must be answered, therefore, is simply, why did Argos and Asine become bitter enemies in the last quarter of the eighth century?

It would be tempting to suggest that enmity arose between them and that Asine was destroyed because the Argives coveted their land. Pausanias, as a matter of fact, does expressly state that the Argives added the territory of Asine to that of their own,²⁵ but there is some evidence to the contrary. In the first place, both Tiryns and Nauplia appear to have retained at least a measure of independence even after Asine was destroyed.²⁶ It is hardly conceivable that these settlements, which were situated between Argos and Asine, should remain at least partially independent while territory around Asine itself much farther to the south was annexed by the Argives. Secondly, and more importantly, we know that Asine was not occupied. Although it was favorably situated for overseas trade, the Argives made no attempt to capitalize upon the natural

²² V. R. d'A. Desborough, *The Protogeometric Pottery* (Oxford, 1952) 204–205, 211–212 on the Protogeometric pottery found there, and on the Late Geometric period see Robin Hägg, "Geometrische Gräber von Asine," *Opusc. Ath.* 6 (1965) 138, and Courbin, *CGA* 61.

²³ Pausanias 4. 34. 11 notes that even in his day the Asinaians (of Messenia) took great pride in the fact that they were Dryopes, and that they celebrated mysteries in honour of Dryopes every other year.

²⁴ Pausanias 4. 34. 11 says they established a cult of Apollo at their new home in Messenia, and that they regarded Dryops as the son of Apollo. Barrett, *Hermes* 82 (1954) 438–441 has argued that the cult of Pythian Apollo at Asine was perhaps the oldest cult of this god in the Peloponnesus. ²⁵ 2. 36. 5.

²⁶ In "The Calaurian Amphictiony," *AJA* 70 (1966) 113–121 I have argued that Nauplia was independent in the second quarter of the seventh century. The evidence suggesting Tirynthian independence comes from an oracle from Delphi preserved in the *Palatine Anthology* 14. 73, which refers to the Argives as a people dwelling between Tiryns and Arcadia. This, as F. Gschnitzer, *Abhängige Orte im griechischen Altertum, Zetemata* 17 (1958) 77 has pointed out, clearly implies that Tiryns was not under Argive control at the time. H. W. Parke and D. E. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*² (Oxford, 1956) 82–83 date the oracle to the early seventh century. The fact that both communities enjoyed at least partial autonomy at this time appears to be inconsistent with my thesis that Argos was trying to extend its control over the plain, but the appearance is deceptive. I hope to treat this matter more fully in a history of Argos which I am preparing.

advantages which the site possessed. Instead, the town was levelled; its inhabitants expelled; and then the Argives withdrew. It is true that the temple of Apollo remained standing, and it is certainly possible that the Argives did make some use of the agricultural land in the vicinity. But the fact that the site itself was left unoccupied and deserted for nearly four hundred years suggests that the Argives did not undertake their campaign in the hope of acquiring new territory. The origin of Argive-Asinaian enmity and consequently the real motives behind the destruction of Asine must, therefore, lie elsewhere.

One of the outstanding characteristics of Greek history in the late eighth and early seventh century was an inordinate amount of warfare which was then being waged. Only a few of the more well-known conflicts need be cited here. Mention has already been made of the First Messenian War between Sparta and Messenia; probably about the same time Corinth and Megara fought for control of the southern Megarid;²⁷ while farther to the north Chalcis and Eretria contested for dominance over the Lelantine plain.²⁸ The circumstances which led to each of these wars and others not mentioned here were similar and familiar. As Greece was emerging from the Dark Ages certain Greek states were intent upon increasing their power and extending the area under their control, while other Greek states were equally intent upon resisting such encroachment. I would like to suggest that Argive-Asinaian enmity arose from a similar situation.

There is in fact some reason to believe that Argos was attempting to extend its control over a wider area in the latter half of the eighth century. In this connection the first thing which must be noted is the construction of the Argive Heraeum. Although it is not possible to date the construction of this temple precisely, the evidence leads to the conclusion that it was probably erected in the third quarter of the eighth century. In the course of his excavation of the near-by chamber tombs Professor Blegen conducted some soundings beneath the Old Temple Terrace Wall at the site. Although the results of this work were somewhat disappointing, potsherds which he identified only as Geometric were unearthed. These, moreover, were discovered "at so great a depth from the face of the terrace that it seemed . . . impossible to believe that they could have reached their place after the building of the wall."²⁹ The absence of any Proto-

²⁷ Plutarch, *Greek Questions* 17. N. G. L. Hammond, "The Heraeum at Perachora and Corinthian Encroachment," *BSA* 49 (1954) 93-102 dates the war to the last quarter of the eighth century.

²⁸ Herodotus 5. 99; Thucydides 1. 15; Plutarch, *Moralia* 760e-761b; Strabo 10. 1. 11-12 (448). The war is most often dated to the latter part of the eighth century; see W. G. Forrest, "Colonisation and the Rise of Delphi," *Historia* 6 (1957) 160-175; John Boardman, "Early Euboean Pottery and History," *BSA* 52 (1957) 27-29 suggests that there was perhaps a series of wars between Eretria and Chalcis during the period ca 750-700 B.C.

²⁹ Carl W. Blegen, *Prosymna: The Helladic Settlement Preceding the Argive Heraeum* (Cambridge, 1937) 18-20, and also his "Prosymna: Remains of Post-Mycenaean Date," *AJA* 43 (1939), 410ff.

corinthian pottery from these soundings suggests that the wall was erected before this style made its appearance about 725 B.C.,³⁰ and this date can serve as an approximate *terminus ante quem*. Paul Courbin has recently dated the earliest Geometric pottery found at the site to a little before 750 B.C.,³¹ and this date can serve as an approximate *terminus post quem*. It need not, however, necessarily coincide exactly with the erection of the temple itself. Only a few sherds can be dated this early, and in any case the actual construction of the retaining wall, temple terrace, and the temple itself may well have taken a considerable amount of time.³² The erection of a temple at this site five miles northeast of the city of Argos proves that this area was certainly under Argive control at the time. They would hardly have gone to the trouble and expense of erecting this temple to their patron goddess unless they were absolutely certain that it could be defended.

Nor is it without significance that the inhabitants of Mycenae as well as those of Argos worshipped at this temple. Just east of the Heraeum and between it and Mycenae lies a deep ravine. Here, the foundations of a bridge which once spanned this ravine were excavated by Professor Blegen. Although he was unable to determine the precise date of its construction, no objects of Mycenaean date were found when the foundations were cleared, and presumably, therefore, the bridge dates from a later period. The only datable remains uncovered were some seventh century bronze objects, and from their location Blegen was able to infer that the bridge was already standing when they came to rest there. He believed that it was built in conjunction with the retaining wall and the Old Temple Terrace at the Heraeum, and that it was therefore contemporary with them.³³ It is no longer possible to retrace the course of the roadway which once crossed this bridge, but it is certain that it ran in the general direction of Mycenae, and it could, therefore, have served only one function: to allow access to the Heraeum for worshippers coming from that once mighty citadel.

The least this suggests is that Argos and Mycenae were on good terms in the third quarter of the eighth century. Whether or not relations between the two

³⁰ A. Frickenhaus and W. Müller, "Aus der Argolis: Bericht über eine Reise vom Herbst 1909," *AM* 36 (1911) 26–27 report finding Protocorinthian pottery between the blocks of the wall, and they believed it had been desposited there during the course of construction, but Professor Blegen's findings would suggest that they were in error.

³¹ *CGA* 565 with n. 3.

³² This was an immense building project; nothing comparable had been undertaken anywhere in the Greek world since the Mycenaean period. The retaining wall, or Old Temple Terrace Wall was more than fifty five meters in length and about six meters high in places. Some of the stones measured more than five meters in length and two meters in width. Moreover, there would appear to be no nearby source of conglomerate stone, the nearest deposit being just outside the citadel at Mycenae; on this see Charles Waldstein, *The Argive Heraeum* I (Boston, 1902) 92–93, 99–100, 109ff. The architectural remains are discussed by Pierre Amandry, "Observations sur les monuments de l'Héraion d'Argos," *Hesperia* 21 (1952) 223ff.

³³ Blegen, *AJA* 43 (1939) 427–430.

communities continued to be amicable in the last quarter of that century is another matter. While there is perhaps no irrefutable proof to the contrary, the emergence of localism within the Argive plain particularly in the last two decades of the eighth century is striking. About 700 the inhabitants of Mycenae established a hero cult of Agamemnon just outside the walls of their city.³⁴ The worship of this legendary local hero can only be interpreted as an expression of Mycenaean as opposed to Argive sentiments. The destruction of Asine may reflect still another expression of such localism, more properly defined in this instance, perhaps, as open anti-Argive feeling.

If the destruction of Asine is considered in this context, the reasons for the Argive action seem clear enough. It would appear that in the latter half of the eighth century the city of Argos was attempting to increase and extend its influence in and around the Argive plain. This attempt, thanks in part to the military superiority of the Argives, was in the main successful. We know that Tiryns and Nauplia must have been on friendly terms with the Argives about the time Asine was destroyed; this can be inferred from the fact that both settlements are situated between Argos and Asine. Since they were not disturbed when Asine was destroyed, they must have been at least passive accomplices. The Mycenaeans too, however reluctantly, seem to have gone along with the wishes and desires of the Argives. But in the case of Asine the situation was somewhat different. This settlement was located some distance beyond the plain, and in relative terms some distance away from the city of Argos. Their location might have given the Asinaians a false sense of security and convinced them they could resist their more powerful neighbor to the north. When they proved to be obstinate the Argives did not hesitate. They resorted to military means to bring them into line, and this in itself was smart politics. The treatment which Asine received at the hands of the Argives could not have passed unnoticed by the inhabitants of the other settlements in the plain. Calculated or spontaneous, it would certainly remind them that Argos had the situation well in hand, and that further opposition to Argive aims and wishes was both useless and foolhardy.

If the reconstruction suggested here is at all valid, there can be no doubt that the Spartans were greatly concerned with the course of events in the Argive plain. Although preoccupied with troubles closer to home, they may have sent token aid and encouragement to the Asinaians in their struggle to resist Argive domination, but every advantage lay with the Argives. Once the Asinaians had been defeated, the Spartans allowed them to settle in newly-acquired Messenia, hoping no doubt, that they would one day prove a willing ally against the Argives, whose fortunes seemed now to be on the rise.

³⁴ J. M. Cook, "The Agamemnoneion," *BSA* 48 (1953) 30-68, and the same author's "The Cult of Agamemnon at Mycenae," *Geras Antoniou Keramopoulou* (Athens, 1953) 112-118.

It was for these reasons that Asine was destroyed by the Argives and not for any aid they had given the Spartans in an aggressive invasion of Argive territory. Although Pausanias correctly noted that the inhabitants of Asine were driven from their home in the Argolid and that they founded a new settlement in Messenia, there is no reason why the explanation he gives for this event should be accepted without question. The story which he preserves would appear to be a later attempt by the Argives to convince either themselves, their neighbors, or perhaps both that they had acted justly in the matter.

University of Alberta

THOMAS KELLY



Diodore de Sicile et Agatharchide de Cnide

Author(s): W. Peremans

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Sep., 1967, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967), pp. 432-455

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435003>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

DIODORE DE SICILE ET AGATHARCHIDE DE CNIDE

Au troisième livre de sa *Bibliothèque historique*, Diodore de Sicile donne une description de la Mer Rouge qui commence par la phrase suivante: Περὶ δὲ τοῦ καταλειμμένου μέρους, λέγω δὲ τοῦ Ἀραβίου κόλπου, ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βασιλικῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἐξελήφότες, τὰ δὲ παρὰ τῶν αὐτοπτῶν πεπυσμένοι (III, 38, 1). «Nous allons traiter à présent des parties dont il nous reste à nous occuper, savoir, le golfe Arabique, dont nous emprunterons la description en partie aux Annales royales d'Alexandrie et en partie aux renseignements donnés par des témoins oculaires»¹.

Ailleurs également, Diodore parle de la méthode qu'il a suivie. Au chapitre 11 du même livre III, par exemple, il déclare: «Avant de reprendre notre sujet, il sera nécessaire de donner un aperçu des nombreux historiens qui ont traité de l'Égypte et de l'Éthiopie. Parmi ces historiens, les uns ont ajouté foi à de fausses traditions; les autres, ayant forgé des fables à plaisir, ne méritent, avec raison, aucune foi. Cependant Agatharchide de Cnide, dans le second livre de son histoire de l'Asie, le géographe Artémidore d'Ephèse, dans le huitième livre de son ouvrage, et quelques autres écrivains qui ont habité l'Égypte, et qui ont rapporté la plupart des détails précédents, ont presque toujours rencontré juste. Enfin, nous-même, pendant notre voyage en Égypte, nous avons eu des relations avec beaucoup de prêtres et nous nous sommes entretenu avec un grand nombre d'envoyés éthiopiens. Après avoir soigneusement recueilli ce que nous avons appris de cette manière, et compulsé les récits des historiens, nous n'avons admis dans notre narration que les faits généralement avérés»².

Cette traduction rend assez fidèlement le texte original. Nous voudrions cependant faire observer qu'à la fin de ce texte, F. Hoefer traduit: «après avoir . . . compulsé les récits des historiens». Diodore écrit: «τοὺς λόγους τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἐξελέξαντες», ce qui donne à notre avis un sens un peu différent. Ἐξελέγχω signifie en effet: «réfuter, confondre, fournir une preuve, vérifier, examiner» et semble indiquer une activité personnelle plus intense de la part de Diodore. Celui-ci aurait soumis les récits des auteurs à un examen attentif en se basant sur les sources directes dont il disposait³.

En ce qui concerne le contenu, ce second texte de Diodore (III, 11, 1-3) est assez différent du passage que nous avons cité en premier lieu (Diod., III, 38, 1).

¹ Trad. F. Hoefer, Paris, Hachette, 1865², I, p. 220.

² Ibid., p. 192/3.

³ cfr. Plut., Arist., 26, 2: παρατίθεσθαι τοὺς ἱστοροῦντας.

Il contient d'abord une prise de position sur la méthode à suivre beaucoup plus longue. Mais on remarque surtout que Diodore consacre en tout premier lieu son attention aux auteurs, parmi lesquels il distingue les mauvais et les bons. Il parle ensuite des renseignements qu'il a obtenus de façon directe grâce à son voyage en Egypte, où il a rencontré des prêtres ainsi que des ambassadeurs venant de l'Ethiopie. Il termine en disant de quelle manière il a procédé dans sa rédaction finale.

Au chapitre trente-huit, il ne parle pas de façon explicite des auteurs comme source d'information et il se contente de citer comme base de son exposé les *hypomnemata* du roi à Alexandrie et les rapports des témoins oculaires. Il faudra voir, dans la suite de cet exposé, ce qu'il faut entendre par ces deux catégories de sources.

Ce passage III, 38 fait partie d'une série de chapitres du troisième livre où Diodore est tributaire d'Agatharchide de Cnide.

Dans l'ouvrage de C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores*, I (1882), pp. 123-193, on trouve le texte de Diodore de Sicile (III, 11, 4-III, 48) mis en parallèle avec certains extraits d'Agatharchide de Cnide, *De Mari Erythraeo*, livre V, réunis par Photius, le patriarche de Constantinople du 9^e siècle. On peut en déduire, comme on l'a fait, que la phrase du chapitre trente-huit que nous examinons a été empruntée, avec le reste, à l'ouvrage d'Agatharchide sur la Mer Rouge.

Parlant de la méthode suivie par Diodore et des sources qu'il a utilisées, C. Wachsmuth décrit comme suit les rapports entre notre auteur et Agatharchide de Cnide⁴. «Ebenso steht es mit Agatharchides, dessen Beschreibung der Völker des Erythraeischen Meeres er, wie wir aus den von Photios gegebenen Auszügen aus diesem interessanten Historiker kontrollieren können, umfassend (im 3. Buch) ausgenutzt und stellenweise einfach wörtlich abgeschrieben hat, so wörtlich und zugleich gedankenlos, daß er sogar einen Hinweis auf eine frühere Bemerkung (III, 41, 1 *προειρήκαμεν*) mit aufnimmt, ohne daß er selbst diese Bemerkung gegeben hätte, oder daß er versichert (III, 38, 1), er werde seine Beschreibung des «Arabischen Busens» geben, «theils aus den königlichen Memoiren in Alexandria, theils nach persönlichen Erkundigungen bei Augenzeugen» d.h. die Worte selbst wiederholt, mit denen jener die Zuverlässigkeit seiner Beschreibung verbürgt hatte, gleichsam als ob er selbst die Memoiren eingesehen oder die Augenzeugen gesprochen hätte».

En s'exprimant ainsi, C. Wachsmuth ne faisait que reprendre l'affirmation de C. Müller qui, dans les *Geographi Graeci Minores* (I, p. 165, § 79, note), écrivait : «Quod Diodorus initio hujus sermonis ait descriptionem orae sinus Arabici se subjungere partim ex commentariis regis partim e fide testium oculatorum id ex ipso transtulit Agatharchide, quem etsi non nominat, tamen presso pede in singulis quibusque sequitur».

⁴ Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte, Leipzig, 1895, p. 95.

F. Susemihl⁵, de son côté, avait cru pouvoir affirmer: «Aus ihnen (sc. Auszügen) erhellt, daß was wir bei Diod. III. 12–49 lesen, fast lediglich aus dem 5 B. wörtlich abgeschrieben ist. Es ist bezeichnend für Diodoros, daß er hier diese seine Quelle nicht nennt, wohl aber für den weit kürzeren voraufgehenden Abschnitt das Geschichtswerk des A. über Asien».

Ces textes que nous avons voulu transcrire in extenso reflètent fidèlement l'opinion qui prévaut encore aujourd'hui, au moins en général, concernant la paternité de la phrase citée au début de cet exposé.

Les arguments qui plaident en faveur de Diodore de Sicile ne semblent pas convaincre la plupart des savants qui se sont intéressés au problème.

Il y a en tout premier lieu le fait que dans le texte de Diodore nous nous trouvons devant un témoignage provenant de l'antiquité et dont, selon les règles d'une saine critique historique, nous devons tenir compte jusqu'à preuve du contraire. Avons-nous le droit d'affirmer que Diodore ne dit pas la vérité dans ce passage et qu'il n'a consulté ni les hypomnemata de la cour d'Alexandrie, ni les rapports des témoins oculaires mais qu'il reprend cette phrase à Agatharchide de Cnide?

Les adversaires de Diodore lui en veulent parce que plus loin dans son texte (III, 41, 1) on lit: ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων τῶν τόπων τὸν μὲν ἀπὸ Πτολεμαΐδος παρά-πλου ἐως τῶν Ταύρων ἀκρωτηρίων προειρήκαμεν, ὅτε Πτολεμαίου τὴν τῶν ἐλεφάντων θήραν ἀπηγγείλαμεν. «Nous avons décrit la traversée depuis Ptolémaïs jusqu'au promontoire des Taureaux, lorsque nous avons parlé de la chasse que Ptolémée fit aux éléphants»⁶. C. Müller⁷ remarque à propos de cette déclaration de Diodore: «At nusquam de his Diodorus exposuit, sed temere exscripsit Agatharchidem, qui de hoc tractu, quem paucis nunc absolvit, accuratius exposuerit ubi de Eumede ad elephantorum venationem emissio deque prima Ptolemaidis origine sermonem instituit. Nonnulla hinc servavit Artemidorus».

Artémidore est mentionné par Strabon (16, 4, 5) dans un paragraphe où on lit: πόλιν εἶναι Φιλωτέραν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀδελφῆς τοῦ δευτέρου Πτολεμαίου προσαγορευθεῖσαν, Σατύρου κτίσμα τοῦ πεμφθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν διερεύνησιν τῆς τῶν ἐλεφάντων θήρας καὶ τῆς Τρωγλοδυτικῆς. Voilà un passage qui, par l'intermédiaire d'Artémidore, peut remonter à Agatharchide et auquel le προειρήκαμεν de Diodore (III, 41, 1) peut se rapporter.

Il y en a un second chez le même auteur. Strabon (16, 4, 7) écrit: εἴθ' οἱ Ταῦροι, δύο ὄρη τύπον τινὰ πόρρωθεν δεικνύντα τοῖς ζώοις ὁμοιον, εἴτ' ἄλλο ὄρος ἱερὸν ἔχον τῆς Ἰσιδος, Σεσώστριος ἀφίδρυμα· εἴτα νῆσος ἐλαία κατάφυτος ἐπικλυζομένη· μεθ' ἣν ἡ Πτολεμαῖς πρὸς τῇ θήρᾳ τῶν ἐλεφάντων, κτίσμα Εὐμήδους τοῦ πεμφθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν ὑπὸ Φιλαδέλφου. Voilà que nous

⁵ Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit, Leipzig, I, (1891), p. 687, n. 253.

⁶ Trad. F. Hofer, I, p. 224.

⁷ Geographi Graeci Minores, I, p. 174 § 84 note.

rencontrons dans un même passage de Strabon, qui dépend très probablement d'Agatharchide, la mention des Taureaux, de Ptolémaïs et de la chasse aux éléphants c.-à-d. de toutes les données de Diodore III, 41, 1 où l'on retrouve le terme *προειρήκαμεν*.

On peut conclure, semble-t-il, qu'en écrivant *προειρήκαμεν* Diodore trahit une dépendance qu'on peut qualifier de servile vis-à-vis d'Agatharchide. C. Wachsmuth⁸ indique d'autres passages dans Diodore montrant que l'usage fait par cet auteur d'autres historiens comme Polybe et Poseidonios par exemple n'est pas plus intelligent.

Avons-nous ainsi prouvé que Diodore n'est pas l'auteur de la phrase III, 38, 1 et qu'il faut par conséquent l'attribuer à Agatharchide? Evidemment non. On dira plutôt que différentes possibilités doivent être envisagées.

Pour défendre les titres de Diodore, on peut encore faire remarquer que dans le passage en question Agatharchide n'est pas mentionné alors qu'il l'est dans d'autres chapitres, par exemple I, 41, 4; III, 18, 4 et 48, 4. La façon de procéder de Diodore est plutôt irrégulière. Il est évident qu'il s'est inspiré d'Agatharchide au moins pour les chapitres III, 11, 4-III, 48. Or, dans tout cet exposé, Agatharchide est mentionné deux fois seulement. Autant dire que Diodore a souvent utilisé l'historien de Cnide sans le citer. Il s'agit donc de préciser si possible les passages dans cette série de chapitres où Diodore dépend d'Agatharchide et, plus particulièrement, de savoir si tel est le cas pour la phrase III, 38, 1.

On peut faire remarquer qu'une partie de ce chapitre ne dérive sûrement pas d'Agatharchide, celle notamment qui fait immédiatement suite à III, 38, 1. En voici la traduction de F. Hoefer: «Car on n'a qu'une faible connaissance de cette partie du monde, ainsi que des îles Britanniques et du Nord. Mais nous décrivons les pays septentrionaux, voisins des régions inhabitables par le froid, lorsque nous en serons au temps de César qui, après avoir soumis à la puissance des Romains des contrées si éloignées, a procuré aux historiens des documents qui leur manquaient». Après cette note consacrée aux pays du Nord, il aborde la description du golfe Arabique.

* * *

Voilà la façon dont on défendait Diodore contre les attaques de C. Wachsmuth, F. Susemihl, C. Müller et d'autres et les réponses des adversaires. Mais on n'obtenait pas de résultat définitif.

Une voie nouvelle fut suivie par Melle J. Pirenne dans son ouvrage *Le royaume Sud-Arabe de Quatabân et sa datation d'après l'Archéologie et les Sources Classiques jusqu'au Périple de la Mer Erythrée*⁹.

«Un examen attentif» écrit-elle «des textes de Photius (reproduisant Agatharchide) et de Diodore, pour toute cette section concernant la côte d'Arabie

⁸ o.l., p. 94 et suiv.

⁹ Louvain, 1961, pp. 80-91.

(§ 78 à 97 de Müller) montre que c'est Diodore qui a utilisé ces Annales royales et qu'il en tire précisément ce qui figure dans son texte et manque dans la recension de Photius¹⁰. Et plus loin (p. 88) : «La plupart des passages de Diodore, sans parallèle dans Photius, concernent des initiatives, ou des dispositions prises par les rois d'Alexandrie. On pourra constater que le reste se ramène à des précisions concernant la navigation (choses qu'Agatharchide néglige) ou des rapports de visiteurs des lieux».

Au paragraphe 78 de l'édition Müller des *Geographi Graeci Minores*, Melle Pirenne fait remarquer que chez Diodore de Sicile le récit d'une chasse au serpent se place sous Ptolémée II περί τε τὴν τῶν ἐλεφάντων κυνηγίαν φιλοτιμηθεῖς et que Photius dans le passage correspondant ne parle pas du Lagide¹¹.

Au § 82 où il est question de l'île Ophiodes, infestée de serpents, Diodore dit : ἐν δὲ τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις χρόνοις ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν βασιλέων οὕτως ἐξημερώθη φιλοτίμως, ὥστε μηδὲν ἔτι κατ' αὐτὴν ὁρᾶσθαι τῶν προὔπαρξάντων ζώων. Parlant des mêmes faits, Photius s'exprime ainsi : Ὀφιδῶδη, πρότερον μὲν γέμουσαν παντοίων ἐρπετῶν, ἐφ' ἡμῶν δὲ ἐλευθέραν τούτων¹². On constate que Diodore mentionne de façon explicite «les rois d'Alexandrie», alors que Photius n'en parle pas.

Au § 83, le texte parle des bateaux transportant des éléphants et des malheurs qui leur arrivent. Τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς ἐλεφαντηγούς κακὸν πολὺν ἔλεον τοῖς πάσχουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρώντων ἐκκαλεῖται dit Photius, tandis que Diodore s'exprime comme suit : αἱ δὲ τοῦς ἐλέφαντας διάγουσαι . . . μεγάλους καὶ δεινούς ἐπιφέρουσι κινδύνους τοῖς ἐν αὐταῖς πλέουσι.

A la fin de son exposé qui est beaucoup plus long que celui de Photius (71 lignes contre 21 lignes), Diodore mentionne un ordre du roi qui prescrit de laisser là les navires qui ont échoué pour signaler aux marins les endroits qui peuvent causer leur perte. Πρόσταγμα γάρ ἐστι βασιλέως¹³.

Le § 85 ne se retrouve que chez Diodore. Il contient au début le passage suivant : Οὗτος γὰρ ὀνομάζεται Ποσειδεῖον, ἰδρυσαμένου Ποσειδῶνι πελαγίῳ βωμὸν Ἀρίστωνος τοῦ πεμφθέντος ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου πρὸς κατασκοπὴν τῆς ἕως Ὀκεανοῦ παρηκούσης Ἀραβίας. Encore une fois il est fait mention expressément de Ptolémée II qui a chargé d'une mission d'exploration Ariston, dont nous reparlerons plus loin¹⁴.

Le § 88 manque également chez Photius. Il y est question de pirates, combattus par les rois d'Alexandrie : ὕστερον δὲ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας βασιλέων πλωτὸν τοῖς ἐμπόροις ποιησάντων τὸν πόρον¹⁵.

Se basant sur les cinq paragraphes que nous venons de mentionner, Melle Pirenne (p. 88) conclut : «Ce qui ressort de l'examen correspond si bien à ce qu'annonce l'avertissement, qu'on ne peut douter, croyons-nous, que ce soit

¹⁰ o.l., p. 87.

¹¹ Voir *Geographi Graeci Minores*, I, p. 162.

¹² Voir *Geographi Graeci Minores*, I, p. 170.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 171-173.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 175.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 178.

Diodore lui-même qui ait travaillé d'après les Annales royales et les rapports de témoins oculaires: mais ici, son travail se borne à compléter Agatharchide dont le texte lui sert évidemment de base, ce qu'il ne dit pas».

Voilà une prise de position très nette en faveur de Diodore. Elle n'a pas suffi cependant à désarmer les adversaires de cette thèse, comme le prouve la réplique de F. Altheim – Ruth Stiehl, *Die Araber in der alten Welt*, I (Berlin, De Gruyter, 1964), pp. 65–69.

Après avoir rappelé les arguments de Melle Pirenne, les auteurs attirent tout d'abord l'attention sur le § 110 du texte de Photius, où sont mentionnés les ὑπομνήματα, sans aucun doute les mêmes textes que ceux cités par Diodore III, 38, 1. On n'a donc pas le droit, pensent les auteurs, d'attribuer les ὑπομνήματα à Diodore, comme le fait Melle Pirenne (pp. 66–67). Ces hypomnemata doivent avoir été cités comme sources déjà par Agatharchide.

Quant à la chasse aux éléphants, elle n'est pas mentionnée uniquement au § 78, mais également au § 83, par Diodore et par Photius. Par conséquent, Agatharchide est responsable de cet exposé et doit avoir connu les ὑπομνήματα βασιλικὰ si le renseignement en question dérive de cette source.

Au § 83, il est non seulement question de transports d'éléphants, mais également de navires de guerre (Photius: νηὶ μὲν μακρᾷ) et de bateaux à rames, qui correspondent aux navires de guerre des Lagides – τετρηρικὰ σκάφη – servant à combattre les pirates nabatéens.

Deux entreprises de Ptolémée II, le transport d'éléphants et la guerre sur mer contre les Nabatéens, se retrouvent non seulement chez Diodore, mais aussi chez Photius. Elles ont donc fait l'objet d'un exposé d'Agatharchide qui doit avoir consulté les ὑπομνήματα βασιλικὰ.

Ariston, il est vrai, n'est mentionné que par Diodore, notamment au § 85. Mais Diodore (III, 18, 4) cite également un autre explorateur, Simmias, qui visita les côtes des Ichthyophages sous le règne de Ptolémée III. En parlant de Simmias, Diodore ajoute: ὥς φησιν Ἀγαθαρχίδης ὁ Κνίδιος ἱστοριογράφος.

Altheim-Stiehl attirent ensuite l'attention sur le § 84 avec le terme προειρηκάμεν, dont Melle Pirenne ne parle pas. Nous avons déjà eu l'occasion (p. 435) d'exposer ce petit problème.

Il reste enfin à signaler le § 102: les Sabéens et les Gerrhéens sont les plus riches de tous. Οὗτοι πολύχρυσον τὴν Πτολεμαίου Συρίαν πεποιήκασιν. D'après Melle Pirenne, ce renseignement doit provenir des βασιλικὰ ὑπομνήματα. Or il se retrouve, non pas chez Diodore, mais chez Photius, c.-à-d. qu'il dérive d'Agatharchide.

Altheim-Stiehl sont d'avis que la thèse de Melle Pirenne, tout en étant indéfendable, a conduit cependant à un résultat intéressant. Agatharchide a utilisé «neben Berichten offenbar zeitgenössischer αὐτόπται» les ὑπομνήματα qui renseignaient sur les décisions et les actes des premiers Ptolémées ainsi que sur les événements de leurs règnes. Ces données s'étendirent jusqu'à la

fin du règne de Ptolémée III en 221 a. C. De cette source plus ancienne, donnant des renseignements sur des faits qui précédèrent Agatharchide au moins de 100 à 150 ans, dérive encore l'exposé du § 93.

Il y est question d'une île Charmuthas, possédant un port qui ressemble parfaitement au port de Carthage et qui s'appelle Cothon. On peut en conclure, pensent les auteurs, que Cothon et Carthage existaient encore au moment où ce texte fut écrit, ce qui correspond à la date indiquée pour les βασιλικὰ ὑπομνήματα. Il s'ensuit également qu'on disposait de renseignements précis sur le port de Cothon, grâce sans doute à Timosthène (non pas Timostratos!), amiral de Ptolémée II (*Prosop. Ptolem.*, V, 13794) dont les rapports trouvèrent leur place, comme ceux d'Ariston et de Simmias, dans les ὑπομνήματα.

Voilà les réflexions de Altheim-Stiehl à propos de l'exposé de Melle Pirenne.

Contentons-nous provisoirement, sans vouloir émettre un avis sur la valeur des différentes thèses, d'ajouter encore deux textes aux exposés précédents.

Nous avons cru remarquer qu'au § 24 (= Diod., III, 12, 2), Melle Pirenne aurait pu trouver un argument en faveur de sa thèse si elle ne s'était pas limitée, de propos délibéré, aux paragraphes 78 à 97 de l'édition de Müller (*o.l.*, p. 87).

Dans ce paragraphe, d'après Diodore, οἱ γὰρ βασιλεῖς τῆς Αἰγύπτου condamnent aux travaux dans les mines différentes catégories de personnes, des condamnés en justice, des prisonniers de guerre etc. . . Photius, dans le passage correspondant, remplace les rois d'Égypte par ἡ τυραννίς¹⁶.

D'autre part, on constate qu'au § 56, qui ne se retrouve que chez Photius¹⁷, il est question de κυνηγοί et de Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεὺς.

* * *

L'hypothèse ingénieuse de Melle Pirenne ne semble pas avoir apporté la solution définitive du problème qui nous occupe. Peut-être est-il insoluble.

Les textes présentés par Melle Pirenne d'une part, par Altheim-Stiehl de l'autre, ne sont pas concordants. On peut retrouver des renseignements, puisés probablement dans les ὑπομνήματα βασιλικὰ aussi bien chez Photius que dans le texte de Diodore. On a l'impression que Photius, c.-à-d. Agatharchide, a connu et utilisé ces *hypomnemata*, aussi bien que Diodore. Nous devons avouer que l'incertitude subsiste sur le point de savoir quelle fut la méthode de travail de Diodore et celle d'Agatharchide.

Peut-on espérer trouver une solution en faisant remarquer que Melle Pirenne n'a pas utilisé tous les éléments disponibles dans la phrase en question? Il y a en effet τὰ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βασιλικὰ ὑπομνήματα d'une part et de l'autre les αὐτόπται. Et, pour ce qui est des *hypomnemata*, on les qualifie de βασιλικὰ. Ce qui fait trois éléments distincts: 1. ὑπομνήματα 2. βασιλικὰ 3. αὐτόπται. De ces trois données, il n'y a que la deuxième (βασιλικὰ) qui ait

¹⁶ *Geographi Graeci Minores*, I, p. 124.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

été soumise jusqu'ici à un examen rigoureux. Il faut donc pousser l'enquête plus loin.

Voyons en premier lieu ce qu'il nous est possible de savoir au sujet des ὑπομνήματα.

L'indication de la ville où les ὑπομνήματα βασιλικά peuvent être consultés n'a pas une importance particulière. L'auteur aurait pu se baser sur des textes royaux provenant d'une autre capitale.

Quant à l'interprétation du terme ὑπομνήματα, elle présente de sérieuses difficultés. Le dictionnaire de Liddell-Scott offre un large choix de possibilités pour traduire ce vocable: e.a. reminder, mention, memorandum, minutes, public records, dissertations, treatises, division, explanatory notes, commentaries, draft or copy, memorial, petition, notification. D'autre part, F. Bömer a écrit une introduction à l'étude du terme et de la notion ὑπόμνημα: *Der Commentarius. Zur Vorgeschichte und literarischen Form der Schriften Caesars*¹⁸. L'auteur ne donne pas une image complète, ni une enquête exhaustive du problème. Il se contente d'esquisser: «ein kurzer Überblick, der allerdings die dringend erforderliche ausführlichere Behandlung des ὑπόμνημα nicht ersetzen kann» (o.l., p. 215).

Suivant F. Bömer on peut, pour arriver à une définition d' ὑπόμνημα, suivre au moins trois voies et distinguer, pour la période hellénistique: 1. die sogenannten Kollegnachschriften und die daraus entstandenen Schriftwerke; 2. die Memoiren; 3. die Akten der Verwaltung.

Ce n'est pas le moment d'étudier de plus près ces différentes catégories d'écrits ou d'examiner en particulier les fragments d'autobiographie et de mémoires que, sous le titre d' ὑπομνήματα, F. Jacoby a réunis dans *F.Gr.H.* II C. On y trouve e.a. les écrits de Pyrrhus d'Épire (n° 229), d'Aratus de Sicyone (n° 231) et de Ptolémée Evergète II (n° 234). Mieux vaut établir une distinction entre les *hypomnemata* littéraires et non-littéraires.

Les premiers sont sans aucun doute fort intéressants et il vaut la peine d'étudier les ιστορικά ὑπομνήματα. Mais ils ne nous aideront pas à trouver l'interprétation de la phrase de Diodore, III, 38, 1.

Tournons-nous plutôt vers la documentation non-littéraire.

On retrouve le terme ὑπόμνημα avec sa signification non-littéraire dans de nombreux auteurs: qu'il suffise de prendre quelques exemples chez les écrivains de la période hellénistique.

Polybe (18, 33, 2-3) raconte que Philippe V (220-178 a.C.), vaincu par les Romains à Cynoscéphales en 197 a.C., envoya un *hypaspiste* à Larisa avec l'ordre de faire disparaître et de brûler les βασιλικά γράμματα. Il savait en effet à quoi il exposait lui-même et les siens ἐὰν κρατήσωσι Ῥωμαῖοι τῶν ὑπομνημάτων.

¹⁸ *Hermes* 81 (1953) pp. 210-250.

Ce texte a été commenté par P. Collomp¹⁹ comme suit: «'Ecrits royaux' désigne sans doute les archives royales dans leur ensemble. S'il est ensuite parlé d'hypomnemata, c'est peut-être que la partie est prise pour le tout. Et rien assurément ne pouvait être plus utile aux Romains contre Philippe et ses amis que la connaissance du compte rendu journalier des délibérations et des négociations».

Dans un autre texte de Polybe (23, 2, 4-5) nous voyons Démétrius, le fils de Philippe V, accompagné d'Apelles et de Philoclès, venir plaider à Rome la cause de son père. Les sénateurs leur demandent s'ils sont en possession de *τινα ὑπομνηματισμὸν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως*. Démétrius répond affirmativement et montre *τι βιβλίδιον οὐ μέγα*. Alors le sénat le prie de *λέγειν ἥνπερ τὰ ὑπομνήματα περιεῖχε πρὸς ἑκάστον τῶν κατηγορουμένων ἀπόφασιν κεφαλαιώδη*, de dire brièvement ce que les *hypomnemata* contiennent comme réponse à chacune des accusations.

Il est évident que dans ce passage le sens d'*ὑπόμνημα* est très différent de celui du texte précédent, même si on hésite à traduire le vocable, avec P. Collomp, par «compte-rendu journalier des délibérations et des négociations».

De son côté, Strabon appelle les commentaires de César des *ὑπομνήματα* (4, 1, 1): *Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Καῖσαρ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν εἴρηκεν*, alors que ce même écrit est désigné par Plutarque (César, 22, 2) comme éphéméride. *Περὶ δὲ τῆς πρὸς τούτους γενομένης μάχης ὁ μὲν Καῖσαρ ἐν ταῖς ἐφημερίσιν γέγραπεν ὡς ...* (cfr. Comm. De Bello Gallico IV, 13).

Peut-on donc identifier les *hypomnemata* et les éphémérides? Tel était l'avis de U. Wilcken²⁰ dans l'interprétation qu'il présenta d'un passage de Polyaeus (IV, 6, 2): *Ἀντίγονος ταῖς πρεσβεΐαις χρηματίζων προεδιδάσκετο ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, τίνες εἶεν ὡς αὐτὸν οἱ καὶ πάλαι πρεσβεύσαντες καὶ μετὰ τίνων καὶ ὑπὲρ οἷων πραγμάτων*. Ce roi consultait donc les *hypomnemata* pour se documenter sur les ambassades antérieures, au moment où de nouveaux ambassadeurs se présentaient.

Ces *hypomnemata* étaient, de l'avis d'U. Wilcken, des *acta diurna*, des livres journaliers, des éphémérides.

Mais telle n'est pas l'idée de A. E. Samuel dans son étude intitulée *Alexander's Royal Journals*²¹. Il pense que les *hypomnemata* dont parle Polyaeus ne sont pas des livres journaliers, mais plutôt des dossiers, des documents classés dans un certain ordre.

Disons que les différents textes que nous venons de citer ne favorisent point l'unité dans l'interprétation du terme *ὑπόμνημα*. Celui-ci peut avoir des sens très différents.

¹⁹ Chancellerie et diplomatie des Lagides, p. 22.

²⁰ Philologus 53 (1894) p. 111.

²¹ Historia 14 (1965) pp. 1-12.

Obtiendrait-on peut-être un résultat plus satisfaisant en ajoutant au terme ὑπόμνημα le qualificatif βασιλικόν et en se demandant quel peut être le sens de ὑπομνήματα βασιλικά dans Diodore, III, 38, 1 ?

Nous disposons de textes parallèles, dont nous citons quelques exemples.

Dans le texte de Polybe dont nous avons déjà fait état (18, 33, 2-3), il était question de τὰ βασιλικά γράμματα, expression que Collomp interprète ainsi: «écrits royaux, sans doute les archives royales dans leur ensemble» (pp. 28-29).

Appien (Prooem., 10) parle d' ἀναγραφὰ βασιλικαί. Ἐς γὰρ δὴ τοσοῦτο παρασκευῆς τε καὶ στρατιᾶς ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἀναγραφῶν φαίνεται προαγαγὼν τε καὶ καταλιπὼν ὁ δεῦτερος Αἰγύπτου βασιλεὺς μετ' Ἀλέξανδρον. H. White (*Loeb Classical Library*, 1928) traduit comme suit: «Such was the state of preparedness for war shown by the royal accounts as recorded and left by the king of Egypt second in succession after Alexander».

Diodore (18, 4, 2) dit que Perdiccas trouva dans les ὑπομνήματα τοῦ βασιλέως des ordres pour achever la tombe d'Héphaestion ce qui exigeait de grandes sommes d'argent.

Et enfin nous avons un texte de Plutarque (Pyrrhus, 21, 8): τῆς δε φυγῆς οὐ μακρᾶς εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον γενομένης ἐξακισχιλίους ἀποθανεῖν φησι τῶν Ρωμαίων Ἱερώνυμος, τῶν δὲ περὶ Πύρρον ἐν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν ἀνενεχθῆναι τρισχιλίους πεντακοσίους καὶ πέντε τεθνηκότας.

D'après Hieronymus, les Romains s'enfuirent vers leur camp après avoir subi une perte de six mille hommes. De l'armée de Pyrrhus, d'après les *hypomnemata* du roi (the king's own commentaries. – Trad. B. Perrin, *Loeb Classical Library*, 1950), trois mille cinq cent cinq hommes tombèrent.

Plutarque reprend les mêmes termes que nous avons lus chez Diodore (III, 38, 1) et les quatre auteurs que nous venons de mentionner donnent à l'adjectif βασιλικός un sens bien déterminé: qu'il s'agisse de γράμματα, d' ἀναγραφὰι ou d' ὑπομνήματα, les textes que nous venons de lire, indiquent qu'ils traitent de documents appartenant au roi ou réunis par les soins du monarque. Ce qui ne correspond pas à l'interprétation donnée à ce vocable par Melle Pirenne qui supposait pour βασιλικός le sens de: traitant du roi, ayant le roi comme objet.

Il est clair que le terme en question peut se traduire de différentes façons.

Une autre possibilité d'interprétation d' ὑπόμνημα est peut-être offerte par l'examen de termes dérivés comme ὑπομνηματογράφος ou ὑπομνηματίζεσθαι.

Le premier vocable se rencontre assez fréquemment. Tantôt il désigne, comme l'*épistolographe* et le ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσταγμάτων un fonctionnaire supérieur de la Chancellerie du Roi en Egypte ptolémaïque²² ou un des quatre ἐπιχωρίων ἀρχόντων κατὰ πόλιν mentionnés par Strabon (17, 1, 12). Ces

²² cfr. Prosop. Ptolem., I (1950) n° 6-12.

«archontes» sont ὁ ἐξηγητής, ὁ ὑπομνηματογράφος, ὁ ἀρχιδικαστής, ὁ νυκτερινὸς στρατηγός. Ils existaient déjà, dit Strabon, du temps des rois.

Il est difficile de dire exactement quelle fut la fonction de cet *hypomnématographe*. Mais on connaît, dans l'entourage d'Alexandre le Grand, Eumenes qui est mentionné par différents auteurs en sa qualité de secrétaire²³:

Athen. (10, 44, p. 434B): ἐν ταῖς Ἑφημερίσιν αὐτοῦ (sc. Ἀλεξάνδρου) ἄς ἀνέγραψαν Εὐμένης τε ὁ Καρδιανὸς καὶ Διόδωτος ὁ Ἐρυθραῖος. *Arrien* (*Anab.*, 7, 4, 6): Εὐμένει τῷ γραμματεῖ τῷ βασιλικῷ. *Corn. Nepos* (18, 1, 4-6): eum (Eumenes) habuit (Philippus) ad manum scribae loco ... illo (Philippus) interfecto eodem gradu fuit (Eumenes) apud Alexandrum annos tredecim.

Dans le commentaire de Jacoby, on retrouve les différents titres ὁ γραμματεὺς; ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ βασιλικός; ὁ ἀρχιγραμματεὺς. C'était le titre officiel d'Eumenes qui, plus tard (chez Ps. Kallisth., III, 33, 14), fut nommé ὑπομνηματογράφος²⁴.

De l'avis d'U. Wilcken qui, nous l'avons vu (p. 440), mettait sur le même pied les ὑπομνήματα et les éphémérides, Eumenes et Diodote d'Erythrée sont des secrétaires, des *hypomnématographes*, chargés de rédiger les *acta diurna*.

En admettant cette hypothèse, nous ne sommes pas encore renseignés sur le contenu de ces *hypomnemata*. Les actes journaliers peuvent en effet consigner des renseignements et des données de nature fort différente.

Pour le reste, nous retrouvons toutes les difficultés que nous avons déjà rencontrées dans l'interprétation du terme ὑπόμνημα lui-même.

A côté du vocable ὑπομνηματογράφος, nous trouvons le verbe ὑπομνηματίζεσθαι dans un texte bien connu de Polybe (5, 33, 5) qui établit une comparaison entre, d'une part, certains historiens, de l'autre, les «annales publiques, tracées chronologiquement sur les murailles» (Trad. F. Bouchot, 1847), «die kalenderartigen amtlichen Chroniken in ihrer einfachen Weise auf Wänden» (Trad. H. Drexler, *Artemis-Verlag*, Zürich-Stuttgart, 1961), «those who on public authority set up memoranda of occasional happenings in chronological sequence» (F. W. Walbank, *Commentary on Polybius*, Oxford, 1957). Le texte grec se lit comme suit: οἱ τὰ κατὰ καιροὺς ἐν ταῖς χρονογραφίαις ὑπομνηματίζοντες πολιτικῶς εἰς τοὺς τεύχευς.

Les *hypomnemata* dont il est question ici sont des annales, des chroniques, des memoranda, d'après ces différentes traductions. Ces exposés procèdent d'une façon chronologique (ἐν ταῖς χρονογραφίαις) et se retrouvent sur les murailles (εἰς τοὺς τεύχευς). Quelle que soit l'interprétation de κατὰ καιροὺς et de πολιτικῶς, il est évident qu'un texte comme celui-ci nous donne un sens très différent de ceux que nous avons retrouvés dans d'autres passages d'auteurs mentionnant les ὑπομνήματα. Ce passage de Polybe ne fait qu'accroître les difficultés d'interprétation.

²³ cfr. F. Jacoby, F. Gr. H. 117 F 1 et 2 et commentaire.

²⁴ cfr. F. Bömer, *Der Commentarius*, o.l., p. 224.

Cet exposé des sources est sans doute fort incomplet. Mais nous avons nettement l'impression que, même en fouillant davantage les textes, nous n'arriverions pas à une conclusion plus positive. La preuve en est, nous semble-t-il, que ceux qui se sont penchés sur ce problème ne sont pas arrivés à un résultat identique. Les interprétations des βασιλικά ὑπομνήματα de Diodore (III, 38, 1) sont même parfois assez différentes.

Voici ce qu'écrit P. Collomp²⁵: «Bien que ce titre (βασιλικά ὑπομνήματα) semble clairement désigner un document officiel, Koepke (*De Hypomnematis graecis*, I, 1842; II, 1863; II, p. 30) s'appuyant sur un texte de Pausanias (I, 2) ne pense pas que ces mémoires aient eu quoi que ce soit à faire avec le roi ou sa chancellerie. C'étaient, pense-t-il, des écrits privés».

Voilà une interprétation qui n'est plus guère admise en ce moment. Il y a longtemps déjà, F. Susemihl²⁶ était d'avis que les ὑπομνήματα étaient des rapports de voyage, publiés par le gouvernement d'Égypte ou inspirés par celui-ci. Parlant des sources d'Agatharchide, il s'exprime comme suit: «Außer den offiziellen, von der ägyptischen Regierung veröffentlichten Reiseberichten, benutzte er (sc. Agatharchides) Kaufmannserzählungen und die Berichte und Angaben früherer Schriftsteller» (I, p. 688). Dans la note 255, il indique comme source principale «die im Auftrag der Regierung geschriebenen Reiseberichte».

De son côté, H. Kortenbeutel²⁷ entend par βασιλικά ὑπομνήματα les éphémérides royales et précise ainsi son idée (*o.l.*, p. 9): «Wir werden uns zu denken haben, daß die einzelnen Expeditionsleiter, die der König auf das Rote Meer ausschickte, nach ihrer Rückkehr dem König Bericht erstatteten, aus dem die wichtigsten Punkte unter dem Tage der Überreichung des Berichtes in die ἐφημερίδες aufgenommen wurden. Daraus hat dann Agatharchides sein Material genommen».

Melle Préaux²⁸ parlant des expéditions dans les régions du Sud écrit: «Voilà ce qui inspirait les pionniers de la route du Sud et s'exprime dans les mémoires, nous dirions aujourd'hui les rapports, qu'ils adressèrent aux rois. Ces mémoires, nous en avons la matière, presque intacte, dans les relations que rédigeaient Artémidore et Agatharchide et dont Diodore comme Strabon ont farci leurs ouvrages».

De l'avis de M. Rostovtzeff²⁹, Agatharchide utilisait non seulement des sources littéraires, mais il avait également accès à des documents officiels, les ὑπομνήματα βασιλικά conservés à Alexandrie. Il continue: «It is interesting to

²⁵ Chancellerie et Diplomatie, p. 21.

²⁶ Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit, Leipzig, I, 1891; II, 1892. – Voir I, 688 et n. 255.

²⁷ Der ägyptische Süd- und Osthandel in der Politik der Ptolemäer und römischen Kaiser, Diss. Berlin, 1931.

²⁸ L'économie royale des Lagides, Bruxelles, 1939, p. 358.

²⁹ The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, Oxford, 1941, p. 925.

note that the ὑπομνήματα βασιλικά contained so much material on Agatharchides' subject, material which came to the cognizance of the king either directly from the travellers or was incorporated in reports of certain officials of the crown. Still more interesting is the fact that Agatharchides lays the blame for the unfinished character of his work on the interruption in the flow of official reports due, as he says, to τὰς κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἀποστάσεις, caused by the *amixia* of the time of Evergetes II.

Parmi les plus récentes interprétations du terme ὑπομνήματα βασιλικά dans Diodore (III, 38, 1), nous mentionnons celle de Melle J. Pirenne (*o.l.*) et de F. Altheim-Ruth Stiehl (*o.l.*).

D'après la première, «le terme est équivoque. S'agit-il d'Annales ou de relations écrites, ou de rapports ou informations de commerçants?» (p. 87). Elle traduit par «Documents» (p. 81), «Annales royales et Mémoires» (p. 87).

Pour F. Altheim-Ruth Stiehl, les ὑπομνήματα sont «die von Anordnungen und Taten der ersten Ptolemäer sowie von Geschehnissen die in ihre Regierungszeit fielen, berichteten».

Cet aperçu, forcément incomplet, de quelques avis d'auteurs modernes, ne permet pas de retrouver une unité de vues dans l'interprétation du passage de Diodore. Il est probable que les ὑπομνήματα βασιλικά sont des documents officiels et que l'adjectif βασιλικός signifie que certains écrits furent rassemblés et conservés par le roi. Mais il est difficile, sinon impossible, de préciser le contenu de ces *hypomnemata* et de retrouver par ce moyen l'auteur du passage en question de Diodore.

Au moins sait-on que les ὑπομνήματα étaient connus d'Agatharchide et que l'emploi de ce vocable dans Diodore (III, 38, 1), mais non pas dans le passage correspondant de Photius, ne prouve pas que Diodore a vraiment écrit cette phrase (voir p. 9).

Il est vrai qu'on peut se poser différentes questions à propos du passage d'Agatharchide-Photius qui mentionne les *hypomnemata*.

Il ne faut pas, croyons-nous, souligner le fait que chez Photius on ne dit pas τὰ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βασιλικὰ ὑπομνήματα mais simplement τὰ ὑπομνήματα. Malgré cette différence dans la terminologie, il s'agit probablement des mêmes documents.

A la rigueur pourrait-on faire remarquer que Photius ne parle pas des αὐτόπται mentionnés explicitement par Diodore (III, 38, 1).

Peut-on en conclure que la mention des αὐτόπται dans Diodore III, 38, 1 constitue une ajoute personnelle de l'auteur? Cette conclusion ne s'impose pas nécessairement, car au § 110 de Photius, Agatharchide ne parle qu'en passant des *hypomnemata*. Il y donne les raisons qui l'amenèrent à abandonner son métier d'écrivain et une de ces raisons est celle-ci: οὗτε τῶν ὑπομνημάτων διὰ τὰς κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἀποστάσεις ἀκριβῆ παραδιδόντων σχέψιν – nec commentarii, propter defectiones in Aegypto disquisitionem exactam suppedit-

tent³⁰. A cette occasion, Agatharchide n'était pas obligé de répéter qu'à côté des *hypomnemata*, il avait également consulté les *αὐτόπται*.

Cependant la possibilité reste que Diodore ait trouvé dans le texte d'Agatharchide la mention des *ὑπομνήματα βασιλικά* et que, de sa propre initiative, il ait complété la phrase et parlé, lui le premier, des *αὐτόπται*.

Il est évident, en effet, que le chapitre III, 38 de Diodore, où il est question des sources utilisées, n'a pas été repris tout entier à Agatharchide. Puisqu'on constate un *addendum* au texte d'Agatharchide, on peut tout aussi bien supposer que Diodore parle des témoins oculaires de sa propre initiative. Il se peut que Diodore ne comprenait pas exactement le sens des *hypomnemata* à Alexandrie, cités par Agatharchide. En relisant la phrase que nous venons de citer (Photius, § 110): οὐτε τῶν ὑπομνημάτων διὰ τὰς κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἀποστάσεις ἀκριβῆ παραδιδόντων σκέψιν (p. 21), on peut également se demander si ces *hypomnemata* existaient encore du temps de Diodore, s'ils étaient encore utilisés ou s'ils fournissaient encore les renseignements nécessaires, vu l'état d'anarchie qui régnait en Egypte. La décadence de la monarchie lagide et de l'administration centrale à Alexandrie a eu peut-être comme conséquence que la rédaction des *hypomnemata* n'a pas été tenue à jour et que, dès lors, Diodore ne parvenant plus à se faire une idée précise de ces *hypomnemata* a voulu les compléter. Pour cette raison, il aurait ajouté le bout de phrase sur les *αὐτόπται*.

Quoi qu'il en soit, il est requis d'interpréter aussi clairement que possible cette notion des *αὐτόπται* et d'indiquer la place qu'ils occupent dans le passage de Diodore (III, 38, 1).

* * *

En interprétant ce texte, les auteurs modernes ont donné au terme *αὐτόπται* des significations parfois différentes.

F. Susemihl établit une distinction entre les rapports de voyage et les récits de commerçants. D'après lui, les premiers constituent probablement une source officielle, les autres fournissent des renseignements d'ordre privé (cfr. p. 443).

H. Kortenbeutel se prononce plus clairement sur les *αὐτόπται*. «Als zweite Quellengruppe gibt Agath.-Diod. (III, 38, 1) an: τὰ παρὰ τῶν αὐτοπτῶν. Dazu werden neben mündlichen Berichten von Reisenden auch schriftliche Aufzeichnungen oder Publikationen gehört haben, die wissenschaftliche Begleiter von Expeditionen oder geschulte Expeditionsleiter gemacht haben. So nennt uns Agath.-Diod. III, 18, 4 einen Simmias, den Euergetes zur Erforschung des Ichthyophagen-Landes ausschickte. Er schrieb darüber ein eigenes Werk»³¹.

Mademoiselle Préaux (o.l., cfr. p. 533) ne parle pas des *αὐτόπται*. Quant à M. Rostovtzeff, il mentionne «the reports of the *αὐτόπται*, probably explorers

³⁰ Pour le commentaire de cette phrase, voir e.a. F. Gr. H. 86, Commentaire, p. 151; Bouché-Leclercq, Histoire des Lagides, II, p. 61, n. 2.

³¹ o.l., p. 10.

and merchants, who apparently carried out their voyages of exploration and business, not without the knowledge of official circles» (*o.l.*, p. 925).

Pour Melle. Pirenne, les αὐτόπται sont probablement des navigateurs de commerce et F. Altheim-Ruth Stiehl opposent les ὑπομνήματα aux «zeit-genössische αὐτόπται».

La distinction entre *hypomnemata* et αὐτόπται n'est pas toujours très nette. Ainsi H. Kortenbeutel parle dans les deux cas, celui des ὑπομνήματα et celui des αὐτόπται, de chefs d'expédition et de leurs rapports. Et F. Susemihl fait une distinction entre des rapports de voyage et des récits de commerçants.

Ce sont autant de possibilités. Mais qu'y a-t-il de certain dans ces interprétations?

On peut considérer comme acquis qu'il doit y avoir une différence entre les ὑπομνήματα et les αὐτόπται. Sinon, Agatharchide – dans l'hypothèse où celui-ci a écrit la phrase – ou Diodore n'aurait pas établi la distinction.

Ensuite, on peut faire valoir que le terme αὐτόπται signifie témoin oculaire et qu'il a donc un sens bien déterminé, qui peut servir de point de départ dans l'interprétation de l'ensemble de la phrase.

On peut se demander, il est vrai, si les αὐτόπται sont considérés comme témoins oculaires des faits racontés ou comme contemporains de l'auteur qui les présente. Il est probable que c'est le rapport vis-à-vis des faits qui est indiqué.

Pour le reste, il faut abandonner toutes les hypothèses qu'on a formulées concernant soit les *hypomnemata*, soit les αὐτόπται. On a dit, par exemple, mais sans raisons suffisantes, que les *hypomnemata* sont des documents officiels tandis que les αὐτόπται fournissent des renseignements d'ordre privé. On a prétendu également que les αὐτόπται auraient été des commerçants ou que les ὑπομνήματα contenaient les décrets et les actions des premiers Lagides et les hauts faits de leur règne.

Il est inutile de vouloir minimiser la valeur des rapports des témoins oculaires. Il se peut que, dans certains cas, ces αὐτόπται aient servi à confirmer les renseignements tirés des ὑπομνήματα, qui ne contenaient pas de rapports de témoins oculaires.

De toute façon, il faut essayer de définir les ὑπομνήματα à partir des αὐτόπται. Et voici l'hypothèse que nous voudrions formuler concernant les *hypomnemata*.

Des secrétaires du roi, peut-être les ὑπομνηματογράφοι ont probablement composé des écrits qui donnaient la version officielle des faits qui se passèrent dans le royaume et au dehors, à la cour et dans les provinces, chez les étrangers et chez les Egyptiens, durant la guerre et en temps de paix, durant les règnes successifs et dans de nombreuses régions.

Eux-mêmes n'ont pas été témoins des faits qui se produisirent bien loin d'Alexandrie. Ils devaient se fier à des récits, provenant de directions très

différentes, concernant toutes sortes de sujets et présentés de façon divergente. Et peut-être avaient-ils comme tâche principale de grouper tous les renseignements dont ils disposaient de façon à servir les intérêts et le prestige du roi et de la monarchie.

La rédaction terminée et un certain temps s'étant écoulé, personne ne savait plus indiquer les sources des renseignements qu'on avait notés, ni distinguer dans l'ensemble les rapports des témoins oculaires. Pour remédier à cet inconvénient, on essaya de compléter la documentation par d'autres mémoires de nouveaux témoins oculaires. Voilà comment, de façon théorique, on peut se figurer la distinction entre *hypomnemata* et *αὐτόπται*.

Mais est-il possible de se faire une idée plus concrète des témoins oculaires qui ont inspiré Agatharchide? Parfois, mais très rarement, l'auteur nomme ses prédécesseurs qui lui ont servi de sources. Le plus souvent, il faudra se contenter d'hypothèses, qui cependant semblent être assez solides.

Parmi les *αὐτόπται*, nous distinguons quatre catégories de personnes. En réservant pour la fin la série la plus intéressante, nous citons en premier lieu: ceux qui sont connus par Pline l'Ancien et qui trouveront une place dans le sixième volume de la *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*, parmi les écrivains.

Dans l'ordre chronologique, nous avons ici tout d'abord *Philon*, connu par Pline (37, 108), qui cite Juba, roi de Maurétanie (ca. 50 a.C.–ca. 23 p.C.)³²: «ex hac (scil. insula Topazo) primum importatam (scil. Topazin) Berenicae reginae, quae fuit mater sequentis Ptolemaei, ab Philone, praefecto regis mire placuisse». De l'avis de M. Kortenbeutel (*o.l.*, p. 15), ce texte se rattache à la première expédition connue au temps de Ptolémée Sôter et dirigée vers l'intérieur de l'Ethiopie et la Mer Rouge³³.

Philon a décrit son expédition, comme le prouvent les témoignages d'Antigonos³⁴ et de Strabon³⁵. Pour F. Susemihl (*o.l.*, I, p. 655), il n'est pas absolument certain que le chef de l'expédition du temps de Ptolémée I Sôter et l'auteur des *Aethiopica* soient la même personne. Il parle de «Philon, vermutlich der Admiral von Ptolemaeos I.».

Sous le règne de Ptolémée II Philadelphie (285–246 a.C.), on s'enfonça plus loin vers le Sud. Pline (VI, 183) mentionne quelques personnages que H. Kortenbeutel tient pour des chefs d'expédition: «Simili modo et de mensura ejus varie prodidere, primus Dalion ultra Meroën longe subvectus, mox Aristocreon et Bion et Basilis, Simonides minor etiam quinquennio in Meroë moratus, cum de Aethiopia scriberet. Nam Timosthenes classium Philadelphi praefectus sine mensura dierum LX a Syene Meroën iter prodidit».

³² cfr. F. Gr. H. 275 F. 75.

³³ cfr. Gisinger, R. E., 24, 1963, col. 303.

³⁴ Hist. mir., 145 (F. Gr. H. 670 F. 1): τοῦτο δ' ἱστορεῖ καὶ Φίλων ὁ τὰ Αἰθιοπικὰ συγγράψας.

³⁵ F. Gr. H. 670 F. 2 (Strabon, 2, 1, 20): Φιλῶνά τε τὸν συγγράψαντα τὸν εἰς Αἰθιοπίαν πλοῦν.

D'après Pline, *Dalion* fut le premier à dépasser Meroë, ce qui semble montrer que Philon n'était pas allé plus loin que cette île. Dalion écrivit des *Αἰθιοπικά*³⁶.

Aristocréon se retrouve aussi chez les auteurs qui, d'après F. Jacoby (*F.Gr.H.* 667), ont écrit sur l'Éthiopie. Le titre de l'ouvrage est incertain³⁷.

Bion, également mentionné par Pline, écrivit lui aussi des *Αἰθιοπικά*, comme l'attestent de nombreux textes³⁸.

Basilis a écrit des *Ἰνδικά* en deux livres au moins³⁹. Cet auteur aurait été ambassadeur d'Égypte à la cour des rois des Indes⁴⁰. Notons que Basilis se trouve mentionné dans les extraits d'Agatharchide réunis par Photius (§ 64) (*Geogr. Graeci Min.* I, p. 156). Mais s'agit-il chez Pline et chez Agatharchide du même personnage? F. Susemihl (*o.l.*, I, p. 664) répond par l'affirmative. Il faut faire remarquer cependant qu'Agatharchide divise l'*oikoumène* en quatre parties, que Basilis décrit l'orient tandis qu'Agatharchide s'occupe du sud. Dans ces conditions, il faut au moins se demander si le premier a pu servir de source au second.

Simonides Minor résida pendant cinq ans à Meroë et composa un écrit sur l'Éthiopie⁴¹.

Timosthène est présenté par Strabon (9, 421) comme ὁ ναύαρχος τοῦ δευτέρου Πτολεμαίου. Ailleurs (*Geographi Graeci Minores*, I, p. 565, ll. 24-26), il est appelé ἀρχικυβερνήτης τοῦ δευτέρου Πτολεμαίου. Il a écrit περὶ λιμένων et peut-être περὶ νήσων, deux ouvrages, chacun en dix livres⁴². F. Susemihl (I, p. 661) pense que Timosthène n'a pas décrit sa propre expérience mais qu'il a réussi à valoriser les réalisations de ses prédécesseurs, comme Ephore, Dicéarque et Dalion. De l'avis de E. A. Wagner⁴³, Timosthène aurait exploré, comme chef d'une expédition organisée par Ptolémée II, la côte des Trogydites.

La datation des personnages mentionnés par Pline (VI, 183) n'est pas absolument sûre. D'après H. Kortenbeutel (*o.l.*, pp. 17-18), ils appartiennent au règne de Ptolémée II Philadelphie et ils auraient continué l'entreprise commencée par Philon du temps de Ptolémée I Sôter. Dans sa collection de fragments d'historiens grecs, F. Jacoby ne se prononce pas de façon définitive sur cette question. Il date «avant Eratosthène» ou «avant 130 a.C.»

Dans un autre passage (37, 24), Pline mentionne un *Pythagoras*, Ptolemaei praefectus, «der mit der Topasgewinnung auf dem Roten Meer beschäftigt

³⁶ Paradoxogr. Vatic., 2: *Δαλίων φησὶν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Αἰθιοπικῶν* (F. Gr. H. 666 F. 1); R. E., 4 (1901), col. 2022, n° 1; Schmid-Stählin, II, p. 241.

³⁷ F. Susemihl, *o.l.*, I, pp. 81-82; cfr. R. E., 2 (1896), col. 941-942, n° 1.

³⁸ F. Gr. H. 668; cfr. F. Susemihl, *o.l.*, I, p. 664.

³⁹ F. Susemihl, *o.l.*, I, pp. 663-664.

⁴⁰ cfr. F. Gr. H. 718; R. E., 3 (1899), col. 99, n° 3.

⁴¹ cfr. F. Gr. H. 669; R. E., 3 A (1929), col. 197, n° 5.

⁴² F. Susemihl, *o.l.*, I, p. 660 et n. 83; cfr. F. Gisinger, RE, 6 A (1937), s. v.

⁴³ Die Erdbeschreibung des Timosthenes, Leipzig, 1889.

war»⁴⁴. De l'avis de Kortenbeutel, il serait le même Pythagoras qui a écrit un ouvrage *περὶ τῆς Ἑρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης*⁴⁵. Et probablement, il serait à identifier avec Pythagoras qui joua un rôle dans la troisième guerre de Syrie⁴⁶. La première hypothèse de H. Kortenbeutel est considérée comme certaine par Gisinger⁴⁷ qui fait remarquer (col. 304) : «daß er (Pythagoras) mit seiner Schrift, wohl einer der ersten ihrer Art, anregend wirken konnte, erweist schon die gleichbetitelte Schrift des Agatharchides». Il aurait été un des témoins oculaires dont parle notre texte.

Une deuxième série d'αὐτόπται (voir p. 445 f.) est constituée par un groupe de personnages qui sont énumérés en partie dans le deuxième volume de la *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* sous le titre : I. Les Chasseurs 1. Les Officiers et les Sous-officiers a) Les Stratèges (ou les) Eponymes ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν τῶν Ἐλεφάντων.

Ils se distinguent clairement de la catégorie précédente qui groupait les auteurs d'Αἰθιοπικά, Ἰνδικά, Περὶ λιμένων, Περὶ τῆς Ἑρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης puisqu'on ne sait pas s'ils ont jamais écrit le récit de leurs expéditions. Malgré cela, ils ont pu servir de source à Agatharchide, car leurs rapports ont pu servir de base à la rédaction des ὑπομνήματα βασιλικά. Dans cette hypothèse, les deux catégories de sources : ὑπομνήματα et αὐτόπται se rapprochent l'une de l'autre. Mais il faut toujours compter avec le caractère officiel des ὑπομνήματα.

Agatharchide et, à fortiori, Diodore ne se rendaient plus compte du caractère direct des renseignements contenus dans les ὑπομνήματα. De ce fait, ils ont cru devoir compléter leur documentation en faisant appel aux témoins oculaires.

Dans cette deuxième catégorie d'αὐτόπται nous retrouvons *Andronikos*, mentionné dans un papyrus (Wilcken, *Chrestom.*, 451, l. 3) de l'année 223 a.C. et qui, selon ce texte, se trouve à la tête d'une compagnie de chasseurs d'éléphants. Le même document cite le nom de Peitholaos, que nous retrouverons plus loin.

Antiphilos est connu par le texte de Strabon (16, 4, 1) ὁ Ἀντιφίλου λιμὴν. De l'avis de H. Kortenbeutel (*o.l.*, p. 28), il fait partie d'un groupe de quatre hommes, Straton, Demetrius, Konon et Antiphilos, qui auraient organisé des expéditions sous le règne de Philadelphie, soit pour la chasse aux éléphants, soit pour des missions de reconnaissance.

*Charimortos*⁴⁸ est connu par une inscription (*O.G.I.S.*, I, 86, ll. 8-9) : Χαριμόρτωι τῷ στρατηγῷ ἐπὶ / τὴν θήραν τῶν ἐλεφάντων. Il est mentionné également par Strabon (16, 4, 15) qui le cite avec d'autres personnages dont il

⁴⁴ H. Kortenbeutel, *o.l.*, p. 28.

⁴⁵ cfr. F. Susemihl, *o.l.*, I, p. 663.

⁴⁶ U. Wilcken, *Chrestom.*, I, col. I, 23.

⁴⁷ R. E., 24 (1963), col. 302-304, s. v. Pythagoras 10.

⁴⁸ *Prosop. Ptolem.*, II, 4428. — 221-203 a. C.

sera question plus loin: Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ στῆλαι καὶ βωμοὶ Πυθολάου καὶ Λίχα καὶ Πυθαγγέλου καὶ Λέοντος καὶ Χαριμόρτου.

Démétrius appartient à une période antérieure⁴⁹. Il est mentionné par Strabon (16, 4, 9) comme fondateur de αἱ Δημητρίου σκοπίαί⁵⁰.

Eumedes est le fondateur de Ptolemaïs πρὸς τῇ θήρᾳ τῶν ἐλεφάντων, κτίσμα Εὐμήδους τοῦ πεμφθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν ὑπὸ Φιλαδέλφου⁵¹. Il faut le situer par conséquent dans les années 284–246 a.C.⁵².

Eumenes est le fondateur d' Εὐμένους ἄλσος et λιμὴν⁵³.

Konon est mentionné par Strabon (16, 4, 9): βωμὸν Κόνωνος.

Koraos fonda le φρούριον Κοράου καλούμενον et le κυνήγιον τοῦ Κοράου⁵⁴.

Leon fonda σκοπὴ et στήλη ou βωμὸς Λέοντος et a été cité plus haut avec Charimortos⁵⁵.

Lichas est connu e.a. par une inscription (*O.G.I.S.*, I, 82, ll. 4–7): Λίχας Πύρρου Ἀκαρνάν / στρατηγὸς ἀποσταλὴς / ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν τῶν ἐλεφάντων τὸ δεύτερον⁵⁶; il fonda Λίχα θήρα τῶν ἐλεφάντων et στήλη ou βωμὸς Λίχα⁵⁷. D'après M. Launey⁵⁸, Lichas aurait été stratège pour la première fois sous le règne de Ptolémée III Evergète. Il aurait rempli la même fonction après la stratégie de Pythangelos, dont il sera question plus loin.

Peitholaos ou *Putholaos* est le fondateur d' ἀκροτήριον ou ἄκρα, στήλη ou βωμὸς Πυθολάου⁵⁹.

Philippe est connu par Strabon (16, 4, 14): Ἔστι δὲ τις καὶ Φιλίππου νῆσος.

Pythangelos fonda le Πυθαγγέλου καλούμενον τῶν ἐλεφάντων κυνήγιον, Πυθαγγέλου λιμὴν, στήλη ou βωμὸς Πυθαγγέλου⁶⁰.

Satyros est mentionné dans un texte de Strabon (16, 4, 5): Πόλιν εἶναι Φιλωτέραν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀδελφῆς τοῦ δευτέρου Πτολεμαίου προσαγορευθεῖσαν. Σατύρου κτίσμα τοῦ πεμφθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν διερεύνησιν τῆς τῶν ἐλεφάντων θήρας καὶ τῆς Τρωγλοδυτικῆς. Il n'est pas du tout certain que Satyros ait décrit son expédition⁶¹. Mais il est évident que la précieuse expérience de ces officiers a été

⁴⁹ Avant 225 ? – ca. 242/1 ? (Prosop. Ptolem., II, 4420a).

⁵⁰ cfr. H. Kortenbeutel, o.l., pp. 27–28. – P. Hib. 110 V. 78.

⁵¹ Strabon, 16, 4, 7. – cfr. Prosop. Ptolem., II, 4420.

⁵² D'après Susemihl (o.l., I, p. 663, n. 94) "es wird wenigstens nicht ausdrücklich berichtet" qu'Eumedes ait décrit son expédition.

⁵³ Strabon, 16, 4, 10–13. – Prosop. Ptolem., II, 4419a. – ca. 246 a.C. ?

⁵⁴ Strabon, 16, 4, 9. – Prosop. Ptolem., II, 4421. – 284–246 a.C.

⁵⁵ Strabon, 16, 4, 14–15. – Prosop. Ptolem., II, 4421a. – 221–203 a.C.

⁵⁶ Prosop. Ptolem., 4422. – 246 ou 221–209 a.C. ?

⁵⁷ Strabon, 16, 4, 14–15.

⁵⁸ Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques, I, p. 206.

⁵⁹ Strabon, 16, 4, 14–15. – Prosop. Ptolem., II, 4423. – 223 a.C.

⁶⁰ Strabon, 16, 4, 14–15. – Prosop. Ptolem., II, 4425. – 246–221 a.C.

⁶¹ cfr. F. Susemihl, o.l., p. 663, n. 94. – Voir Eumedes et Ariston.

mise à profit, sans qu'on puisse dire de quelle façon elle a été valorisée (cfr. *Prosop. Ptolem.*, II, 4427).

Straton est cité par Strabon (16, 4, 8): καὶ ἡ Στράτωνος νῆσος.

Une troisième série d'αὐτόπται (voir p. 539) pourrait grouper tous les témoins oculaires qui ne sont pas désignés nommément dans les textes et qui, pourtant, ont pu avoir une grande influence. Ainsi, dans Diodore (III, 18, 3), on parle des ἔμποροι. «Plusieurs marchands d'Égypte qui, naviguant à travers la mer Rouge, abordent encore aujourd'hui le pays des Ichthyophages, s'accordent avec notre récit concernant ces hommes apathiques»⁶².

Il est évident toutefois que, dans ce cas, les données sont fort incertaines et qu'il faudra se contenter ici d'hypothèses.

Nous avons réservé pour la quatrième série d'αὐτόπται les cas d'Ariston et de Simmias qui semblent être les plus intéressants.

Ils sont cités tous les deux, individuellement, dans le texte de Diodore qui remonte à Agatharchide.

Au livre III, 42, 1 on lit: Ἀρίστωνος τοῦ πεμφθέντος ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου πρὸς κατασκοπὴν τῆς ἕως ὠκεανοῦ παρηκούσης Ἀραβίας. «Ariston, que Ptolémée envoya explorer les côtes de l'Arabie jusqu'à l'océan» (Trad. F. Hoefer, I, p. 225) (voir p. 436 et p. 437). Ce texte ressemble sans doute à d'autres passages cités plus haut concernant, par exemple, Eumedes ou Lichas (voir p. 450). Mais ces personnages ne se retrouvent pas dans le texte de Diodore, qui semble avoir eu une raison spéciale de mentionner Ariston. Quelle a pu être cette raison?

W. W. Tarn⁶³ a émis l'hypothèse qu'Ariston est l'auteur d'un *Périple* qu'Agatharchide aurait utilisé dans sa description de la côte orientale de la mer Rouge. Au cours de la période ptolémaïque, dit l'auteur, on ne connaît qu'une seule expédition vers les côtes de l'Arabie et on ne dispose que d'un seul *Périple* de cette côte pour la même période. Ne peut-on pas dès lors supposer que ce *Périple* que l'on retrouve d'une part chez Agatharchide, la source de Photius et de Diodore (III, 42-47), et de l'autre chez Strabon (16, 776-778), se base sur le rapport présenté par Ariston après son expédition? De plus Tarn croit pouvoir admettre que le *Périple* original date de la première moitié du 3e siècle a.C. Cette hypothèse s'accorde parfaitement avec l'identification possible d'Ariston, l'explorateur, avec un homonyme connu par un papyrus de 252 a.C.⁶⁴.

⁶² Trad. F. Hoefer, vol. I, p. 199.

⁶³ Ptolemy II and Arabia, in *Journal Egypt. Archaeol.*, 15 (1929) pp. 9-25. Cfr. H. Kortenbeutel, o.l., p. 20.

⁶⁴ P. Cair. Zen. 59247. – Cfr. H. Kortenbeutel, o.l., p. 20.

L'hypothèse de Tarn est fort intéressante. A son avantage, il faut noter qu'Ariston est cité nommément dans le texte de Diodore-Agatharchide et que ce cas ne se présente que deux fois. Si Ariston n'a pas décrit lui-même son expédition, d'autres l'ont fait à sa place. Sans cela, son souvenir n'aurait pas survécu à l'époque d'Agatharchide.

D'autre part, il faut faire remarquer que l'auteur se base sur un *argumentum a silentio*. Il admet qu'il ne connaît qu'une seule expédition et un seul *Périple* pour toute la période ptolémaïque. On comprend les réserves de F. Susemihl qui ne se prononce pas clairement dans le problème du *Périple* d'Ariston⁶⁵.

Diodore (III, 18, 4) cite également *Simmias* comme explorateur du pays des Ichthyophages. Et on a essayé d'identifier ce personnage avec l'auteur d'un *Περίπλους*. Müller⁶⁶ écrit: «Simmiam exploratorem, cujus Diodorus meminit, eundem esse suspicari licet cum eo, quem Περίπλους scripsisse ait Marcianus p. 112 ed. Miller»⁶⁷.

Voici le texte de Marcien⁶⁸: Συμμέας τε ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐνθεῖς τὸν περίπλους. Simmeas qui orbis universi periplum composuit.

Ici, on trouve, de la main de Müller, la note suivante: Συμμέας] haud dubie fuisse Συμμία vel rectius Συμία (v. Steph. Thes. s. v.) monet Hudson. Quinam fuerit geographus Simmias, num Alexandri comes (Arrian. III, 27 etc) an fortasse is, qui Ptolemaei tertii sive Euergetae jussu Ichthyophagorum regionem exploravit, cujusque testimonio Agatharchides (§ 41; ap. Diodor. III, 18) utitur, in medio relinquo»⁶⁹.

Il faut signaler que dans la notice consacrée à Simmias par F. Susemihl, il n'y a aucune allusion au περίπλους mentionné ci-dessus. Voici ce qu'il écrit (I, p. 663): «Simias, ein Vertrauter von Ptolemaeos Evergetes, wird von diesem zur Erkundung der Umgebung des Rothen Meers ausgesandt und gab eingehende, aber wenigstens zum Theil recht fabelhafte Nachrichten über die dortigen Völkerschaften (Diod., III, 18, 4)». F. Susemihl considère donc Simmias comme un auteur. Sans quoi il ne méritait pas de figurer dans une histoire de la littérature. Mais d'autre part, il semble exclu d'indiquer l'ouvrage qu'il aurait écrit.

Si on abandonne l'idée que Simmias est l'auteur du περίπλους mentionné par Marcien, tout en lui réservant une place parmi les écrivains, il faut croire

⁶⁵ o.l., I, p. 663, n. 94.

⁶⁶ Geographi Graeci Minores, I, p. 135 note § 41.

⁶⁷ E. Miller, *Périple de Marcien d'Héraclée*. Epitome d'Artémidore, Isidore de Charax etc. ou supplément aux dernières éditions des Petits Géographes, Paris, 1839. — Marcien est un géographe du 4e/5e siècle p. C.

⁶⁸ Geographi Graeci Minores, I, p. 565, 1. 30.

⁶⁹ La Real-Encyclopädie contient deux notices concernant le même personnage de la période de Ptolémée III: R. E., III A (1927), col. 142–143 (s. v. Simias) et R. E., III A (1927), col. 144 (s. v. Simmias).

que Diodore (III, 18, 4) fournit la preuve de sa qualité d'auteur. Il est donc nécessaire d'examiner attentivement le passage en question de Diodore. En voici le texte et la traduction de F. Hoefel: Καὶ ὁ τρίτος δὲ Πτολεμαῖος, ὁ φιλοτιμηθεὶς περὶ τὴν θήραν τῶν ἐλεφάντων τῶν περὶ τὴν χώραν ταύτην ὄντων, ἐξέπεμψεν ἕνα τῶν φίλων, ὄνομα Σιμμίαν, κατασκεψόμενον τὴν χώραν· οὗτος δὲ μετὰ τῆς ἀρμοττοῦσης χορηγίας ἀποσταλεὶς ἀκριβῶς, ὥς φησιν Ἀγαθαρχίδης ὁ Κνίδιος ἱστοριογράφος, ἐξήτασε τὰ κατὰ τὴν παραλίαν ἔθνη. φησὶν οὖν τὸ τῶν ἀπαθῶν Αἰθιοπῶν ἔθνος τὸ σύνολον ποτῶ μὴ χρῆσθαι. «Ptolémée, troisième du nom, aimant passionnément la chasse aux éléphants qui se trouvent dans ce pays, dépêcha un de ses amis, nommé Simmias, pour explorer la contrée. Muni de tout ce qui était nécessaire pour ce voyage, Simmias explora tout le pays littoral, ainsi que nous l'apprend l'historien Agatharchide de Cnide. Cet historien raconte, entre autres, que cette peuplade d'Ethiopiens apathiques ne fait aucunement usage des boissons». La fin du texte est traduite par C. H. Oldfather (*Loeb Classical Library*) comme suit: «Now he says that the nation of the 'insensible' Ethiopians makes no use whatsoever of drink». Et M. Oldfather ajoute en note (p. 133, n. 3): «'he' i.e. Agatharchides, who is the chief source of Diodorus in this section of his work; cp. Agatharchides 41 (Müller)».

Pour bien comprendre ce texte, il est indispensable de lire la suite du chapitre. En voici une partie (III, 18, 4-6): Φησὶν οὖν τὸ τῶν ἀπαθῶν Αἰθιοπῶν ἔθνος τὸ σύνολον ποτῶ μὴ χρῆσθαι, μηδὲ τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν ἐπιζητεῖν διὰ τὰς προειρημένας αἰτίας· 5) καθόλου δ' ἀποφαίνεται μήτ' εἰς σύλλογον ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλοθενεῖς, μήτε τὸ ξένον τῆς ὀψεως τῶν προσπλεόντων κινεῖν τοὺς ἐγχωρίους, ἀλλ' ἐμβλέποντας ἀτενῶς ἀπαθεῖς ἔχειν καὶ ἀκινήτους τὰς αἰσθήσεις, ὥς ἂν μηδενὸς παρόντος. οὔτε γὰρ ξίφος σπασαμένου τινὸς καὶ καταφέροντος ὑπεξέφυγον, οὔθ' ὕβριν οὔδὲ πληγὰς ὑπομένοντες ἡρεθίζοντο, τό τε πλῆθος οὐ συνηγανάκει τοῖς πάσχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐνίοτε τέκνων ἢ γυναικῶν σφαττομένων ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀπαθεῖς ταῖς διαθέσεσιν ἔμενον, οὐδεμίαν ἔμφασιν ὀργῆς ἢ πάλιν ἐλέου διδόντες· 6) καθόλου δὲ τοῖς ἐκπληκτικωτάτοις δεινοῖς περιπίπτοντες ἡρεμαῖοι διέμενον, βλέποντες μὲν ἀτενῶς εἰς τὰ συντελούμενα, ταῖς δὲ κεφαλαῖς παρ' ἕκαστα διανεύοντες. διὸ καὶ φασιν αὐτοὺς διαλέκτω μὲν μὴ χρῆσθαι, μιμητικῇ δὲ δηλώσει διὰ τῶν χειρῶν διασημαίνειν ἕκαστα τῶν πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν ἀνηκόντων. Et voici la traduction de ce passage par F. Hoefel: «Cet historien raconte, entre autres, que cette peuplade d'Ethiopiens apathiques ne fait aucunement usage des boissons [et que leur nature ne les demande pas] parles raisons que nous avons déjà indiquées. Il ajoute que ces hommes ne se montrent point disposés à s'entretenir avec les navigateurs étrangers, dont l'aspect ne produit sur eux aucun mouvement de surprise; ils s'en soucient aussi peu que si ces navigateurs n'existaient pas. Ils ne s'enfuyaient point à la vue d'une

épée nue et supportaient sans s'irriter les insultes et les coups qu'ils recevaient. La foule n'était point émue de compassion et voyait égorger sous ses yeux les enfants et les femmes sans manifester aucun signe de colère ou de pitié; soumis aux plus cruels traitements, ils restaient calmes, regardant ce qui se passait avec des regards impassibles et inclinant la tête à chaque insulte qu'ils recevaient. On dit aussi qu'ils ne parlent aucune langue et qu'ils demandent par des signes de la main ce dont ils ont besoin»⁷⁰.

Le problème à résoudre est le suivant: qui est l'auteur du passage qu'on vient de lire? Qui est le sujet de *φησὶν οὖν τὸ τῶν ἀπαθῶν Αἰθιοπῶν* (III, 18, 4) et de *καθόλου δ' ἀποφαίνεται* (III, 18, 5)?

Est-ce Agatharchide, comme le pensent les auteurs en général ou bien serait-ce Simmias lui-même?

En lisant III, 18, 4 à partir de *οὗτος δὲ μετὰ τῆς ἀρμοττοῦσης χορηγίας* nous avons l'impression que le verbe *φησὶν οὖν*, qui commence la phrase suivante, a le même sujet que celui de la phrase précédente: *οὗτος . . . ἐξήτασε*.

La partie de phrase *ὥς φησιν Ἀγαθαρχίδης ὁ Κνίδιος ἱστοριογράφος* n'est qu'une proposition incidente.

Si *φησὶν οὖν* a comme sujet Simmias, il en est de même de la phrase suivante qui commence par *καθόλου δ' ἀποφαίνεται*.

La construction grammaticale semble plaider en faveur de Simmias comme auteur de ce passage. Il faut y ajouter que la lecture de ce chapitre laisse nettement l'impression d'un rapport d'un témoin oculaire. En lisant la phrase: *οὔτε γὰρ ξίφος σπασαμένου τινὸς καὶ καταφέροντος ὑπεξέφυγον*, on est convaincu d'avoir sous les yeux le rapport de quelqu'un qui a vécu la scène qu'il décrit. Cet *αὐτόπτης* est Simmias dont le récit continue, semble-t-il, jusque: *ταῖς δὲ κεφαλαῖς παρ' ἑκάστα διανεύοντες* (III, 18, 6). Ce qui suit *διὸ καὶ φασιν* paraît provenir d'une autre source moins bien déterminée.

Le paragraphe correspondant de Photius est beaucoup plus bref. Il ne compte que treize lignes dans l'édition de Müller alors que le texte de Diodore s'étend sur trente – deux lignes. Photius a résumé sa source tandis que Diodore cite complètement Agatharchide qui doit avoir puisé ses renseignements chez Simmias.

Si on admet l'hypothèse que nous avons avancée, notamment que nous avons sous les yeux un texte de Simmias, on peut conclure que cet explorateur a réellement décrit son expédition et qu'il mérite d'être compté parmi les auteurs de la période hellénistique. F. Susemihl lui a donc réservé à bon droit un paragraphe dans son histoire de la littérature alexandrine.

D'autre part, si cette hypothèse se confirmait, nous aurions un nouvel échantillon de la façon de travailler de Diodore. Se trouvant devant un récit

⁷⁰ Les mots entre crochets suppléent à une lacune dans la traduction de F. Hoefler.

d'Agatharchide, il le reprend textuellement. En lisant $\phi\eta\sigma\iota\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\nu$, nous devons nous imaginer que la suite est un récit de Simmias repris par Agatharchide et que Diodore reprend à son tour.

Cette façon de procéder de la part de Diodore ressemble étrangement à celle qui a été dénoncée plus haut (voir pp. 525). Elle semble montrer une nouvelle fois que Diodore, loin d'écrire d'une manière personnelle, se contente de copier sa source d'une façon qu'on a qualifiée de servile.

Quelle conclusion pouvons-nous tirer de cet examen de quelques textes de Diodore de Sicile? Avons-nous prouvé, de façon définitive, que le passage qui nous intéresse en premier lieu (III, 38, 1) n'est pas de Diodore et doit être attribué à Agatharchide? Non. Il est bien difficile de se prononcer dans l'un ou l'autre sens, pour l'une ou l'autre hypothèse. Mais il est permis de penser que si Diodore a copié textuellement sa source en différents endroits (III, 41, 1; III, 18, 4-5), il n'est pas exclu qu'il ait procédé d'une manière identique dans le paragraphe que nous avons étudié (III, 38, 1).

Il vaudrait la peine d'approfondir ce problème pour essayer de se faire une idée plus exacte et plus précise de la méthode de Diodore de Sicile.

Université de Louvain

W. PEREMANS



Ein folgenschwerer Irrtum des Tacitus (Ann. 15, 44, 2ff.)?

Author(s): Erich Koestermann

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Sep., 1967, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967), pp. 456-469

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435004>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

EIN FOLGENSCHWERER IRRTUM DES TACITUS (ANN. 15, 44, 2ff.)?

Die Literatur zum sog. Christenkapitel bei Tacitus ist – im Einklang mit der ihm zukommenden Bedeutung – in neuerer Zeit fast lawinenartig angeschwollen. Ich habe nahezu 100 Abhandlungen gezählt und zum größten Teil auch eingesehen. Seine letzte zusammenfassende Behandlung hat das Kapitel durch Jos. Michelfeit, *Gymnasium* 73, 1966, 514–540, erfahren, der das Material freilich nicht ausgeschöpft hat. Unbekannt ist ihm u.a. geblieben der wichtige Beitrag von Val. Capocci, *Christiana I. Per il testo di Tacito, Ann. 15, 44, 4* (nebst einem Anhang über den Apostel Petrus), *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris XXVIII*, Roma 1962, 65–99 (mit umfassenden und wertvollen Literaturhinweisen). Beide Verfasser haben sich vor allem um das Verständnis des schwierigen Satzes 15, 44, 4 bemüht, der, wie es den Anschein hat, einer überzeugenden Deutung fast unüberwindliche Schwierigkeiten bereitet. Das Verdienst, allen damit zusammenhängenden Fragen umsichtig und mit großem Nachdruck nachgegangen zu sein und dadurch der weiteren Forschung wertvolle Ansatzpunkte geboten zu haben, kommt H. Fuchs, *Tacitus und die Christen*, *Vig. Christ.* 4, 1950, 65 ff., zu (s. auch seine Nachträge und Berichtigungen *Mus. Helv.* 20, 1963, 221 ff.).

Indessen ist bei alledem ein Problem noch garnicht zur Sprache gelangt, dem letztlich ausschlaggebende Bedeutung zukommt: Kann die Beziehung, die Tacitus zu den Christen herstellt, vor einem objektiven Urteil bestehen? Demzufolge erschien es mir zweckmäßig, die Diskussion in eine Richtung zu verlagern, die einen neuen und vielleicht überraschenden Ausblick gewährt. Dabei begnüge ich mich damit, nur die entscheidenden Gesichtspunkte meiner Argumentation herauszuarbeiten. Auf die zahlreichen mit Textgestaltung und Textinterpretation zusammenhängenden Fragen werde ich im vierten Kommentarband, der sich in Vorbereitung befindet, näher eingehen.

15, 44, 2 heißt es, Nero habe, um den Verdacht der Brandstiftung von sich abzulenken, als die „Schuldigen“ andere zur Rechenschaft gezogen (*subdidit reos*), und zwar jene, *quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Chrestianos appellabat*. Zunächst ist zu betonen, daß der ganze Satz inhaltlich und sprachlich fest mit dem vorausgehenden Text verzahnt ist, so daß der verschiedentlich geäußerte Gedanke, es könne sich um einen späteren Zusatz von fremder Hand, also um eine Fälschung handeln, abwegig ist. Überdies tragen die Paragraphen 2ff. unverkennbar taciteischen Stilcharakter.

Nun ist im Mediceus eindeutig *Chrestianos* überliefert (erkannt von G. Andresen, Wochenschr. f. Kl. Phil. 1902, 780f.), eine Lesart, die von zweiter Hand zu *Christianos* verbessert wurde. Auch ich hatte mich bisher in meinen Ausgaben für die letztere Namensform entschieden, um die Verbindung zu der nachfolgenden etymologischen Erklärung *auctor nominis eius Christus* etc.¹ zu gewinnen (so bereits Hirschfeld, Kl. Schr. 1913, 408f.). Andere haben jedoch *Chrestianos* vorgezogen, so Ad. von Harnack, Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums, I^a 398f., unter Hinweis auf die im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert häufig belegte, beim Volk beliebte Umformung und Umdeutung des Christennamens, und zahlreiche Gelehrte sind ihm bis zum heutigen Tage mit unterschiedlicher Motivation gefolgt. Nach erneuter Prüfung bin auch ich jetzt zum gleichen Schluß gelangt.

Es zeugt für die Gewissenhaftigkeit des Schreibers von M, daß er aus seiner Vorlage, die anscheinend ein hohes Alter aufzuweisen hatte, *Chrestianos* überhaupt in den Text aufgenommen hat, obwohl die sich anschließenden Worte die leichte und sodann von zweiter Hand vollzogene Verbesserung nahelegten. Was hat es mit den *Chrestiani* auf sich? Wir müssen, um diese Frage klären zu können, unsere Aufmerksamkeit zuvorderst der ebenfalls höchst umstrittenen Angabe Suetons Claud. 25, 4 zuwenden: *Iudaeos impulsore Chresto* (fälschlich *Christo* Oros. 7, 6, 15) *assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit* (sc. *Claudius*). Für jeden unvoreingenommenen Leser kann das entsprechend sonstigem lateinischen Sprachgebrauch nur heißen: Claudius verjagte die Juden aus Rom, weil sie es auf Anstiften eines Chrestus ständig zu Ausschreitungen in der Stadt kommen ließen. Ich verweise auf die Erklärung von *impulsor* durch Donat (zu Ter. Ad. 967) *in re bona adiutores, in mala impulsores dicuntur*; vgl. ferner Cic. Vatin. 24 *sese auctores et impulsores et socios habuisse sceleris illius eos viros* etc. und Tac. Hist. IV 68, 3 *ne ferocia aetatis et pravis impulsoribus . . . paci belloque male consuleret* (sc. *Domitianus*). Vorsorglich sei auch schon jetzt daran erinnert, daß laut Nero 16, 2 Sueton der richtige Name der Christen bekannt war.

Jene erste Suetonstelle hat jedoch bekanntlich eine viel weitergehende Auslegung erfahren. So schreibt Ed. Meyer, um nur ihn zu zitieren, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, Stuttgart-Berlin 1923, III 463: „Die Unruhen sind nach Sueton durch einen gewissen Chrestus veranlaßt; es ist längst erkannt, daß darin der Name Christus steckt . . . und daß die Angabe, daß die Verkündigung von Christus den Anlaß gab, dahin entstellt worden ist, daß dieser selbst die

¹ Dazu R. Syme, Tacitus, Oxford 1958, II 469: Tacitus „registers the origin of the name *Christiani* with documentary precision“. In der Tat ist es unwahrscheinlich, daß sich der Historiker, wie verschiedentlich in Anschlag gebracht wird, mit einem oberflächlichen Wissen begnügt haben sollte.

Unruhen angestiftet habe“. Das Mißliche² dabei ist freilich, daß Meyer nun auch an der zweiten Stelle, die jene Austreibung erwähnt, seine Zuflucht zu einer nicht unbedenklichen Interpretation nehmen muß, nämlich Acta apost. 18, 1 f.: Bei seiner Ankunft in Korinth bezog Paulus Quartier bei Aquila, einem aus Pontus stammenden Juden, und seinem Weib Priscilla. Beide waren erst „kürzlich“ aus Italien gekommen, „darum daß der Kaiser geboten hatte allen Juden, zu weichen aus Rom“. Wurde der Beschluß des Kaisers wirklich durch interne Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Juden und Christen ausgelöst, so ist nur schwer zu begreifen, warum Lukas jeglichen Hinweis darauf unterlassen hat. „Daß Lukas darüber hinweggeht und jede präzisere Angabe mit deutlicher Absicht vermeidet, erklärt sich daraus“, so meint hingegen wiederum Ed. Meyer III 111, „daß er von dem Ursprung des Christentums in Rom nicht reden will“. Denn „seine ganze Erzählung ist darauf angelegt, daß der Leser ... den Eindruck gewinnt, daß die wahre Christengemeinde Roms eine Schöpfung des Paulus ist“. Auch hier muß also Meyer den an sich einfachen Worten einen tieferen Sinn beilegen, um auf der gleichen Linie wie bei der Ausdeutung Suetons verbleiben zu können.

Gegenüber diesen und ähnlichen gewaltsamen Konstruktionen hat nach meiner Überzeugung Th. Mommsen, Röm.-Gesch. V 523, 2, mit seinem ausgeprägten Sinn für die historische Wirklichkeit das Richtige erkannt, wenn er skeptisch zurückhaltend schreibt: „Daß Sueton ... als Anstifter der beständigen Unruhen in Rom ... einen gewissen Chrestus nennt, ist aufgefaßt worden als ein Mißverständnis der durch Christus unter Juden und Judengenossen hervorgerufenen Bewegung, ohne zureichenden Grund. Die Apostelgeschichte 18, 2 spricht nur von Ausweisung der Juden. Allerdings ist nicht zu bezweifeln, daß bei der damaligen Stellung der Christen zum Judentum auch sie unter das Edikt fielen“. Dem wäre nur das eine hinzuzufügen, daß die Zahl der Christen während der Regierung des Claudius keinesfalls sehr hoch in Rom angesetzt werden darf. Der Apostel Paulus führt im Römerbrief 16 anscheinend alle diejenigen an, die ihm als Christen bekannt waren, insgesamt auch damals noch nur eine sehr kleine Gemeinde, die in der großen Menge der Juden (s. dazu Ed. Meyer III 461) verschwand und erst recht im Getriebe der Weltstadt unterging.

² Die Anhänger Jesu haben sich laut Acta apost. 11, 26 erstmalig im J. 40 in Antiochien als *Christiani* bezeichnet. Eine gewisse Zeit muß schon vergangen sein, bis dieser Name und damit auch derjenige von Christus in Rom bekannt wurden. Die Entstellung des letzteren zu Chrestus, die eine griechische Umwelt voraussetzt, kann nur als Folge einer schon intensiveren Berührung mit dem Christentum verstanden werden. Bis diese Namensform, die im übrigen bei Zerwürfnissen zwischen jüdisch sprechenden Christen und Juden in Rom gar nicht zur Geltung kommen konnte, daselbst publik wurde, werden weitere Jahre verstrichen sein. Wenn Sueton den Namen richtig reproduziert hat, was man annehmen darf, erscheint es schon aufgrund dieser Überlegung als gewagt, die Stelle wie Ed. Meyer zu interpretieren.

Orosius berichtet 7, 6, 15 – fälschlich unter Berufung auf Josephus, der von den Vorgängen schweigt (vgl. Ed. Meyer III 38, 1) –, daß die Verjagung der Juden im 9. Jahr des Claudius stattfand, also im J. 49 oder 50 n. Chr. Die Nachricht kann als einigermaßen verbürgt gelten, da Paulus im J. 50 Aquila und Priscilla bereits in Korinth antraf (s. oben). Da der vierte Princeps nach der Machtergreifung die Juden in Übereinstimmung mit seiner Politik gegenüber König Agrippa auch in Rom tolerierte (vgl. Dio 60, 6, 6 zum J. 41), indem er sie gleichzeitig eindringlich zur Ruhe mahnte, muß es hernach zu schweren Ausschreitungen gekommen sein, die ihn zwangen, das Steuer herumzuwerfen.

Wenn man versucht, über Veranlassung und spezifischen Charakter dieser Tumulte Klarheit zu gewinnen, ließe sich folgendes sagen. Die Juden waren in Rom immer ein Ferment der Unruhe gewesen. Schon Cicero führte im J. 59 in seiner Rede pro Flacco 66 bewegliche Klage über ihr turbulentes Auftreten in den Volksversammlungen. Wie schon früher, sah sich auch in der Folge die Staatsgewalt immer wieder genötigt, gegen sie rigoros vorzugehen. Als letzter hatte Tiberius im J. 19 drakonische Strafen über sie verhängt (vgl. Tac. Ann. 2, 85, 4. Suet. Tib. 36. Jos. Ant. 18, 84). Aber im J. 41 waren sie in Rom wieder so zahlreich vertreten, daß sich Claudius nach Dio a. a. O. auch aus diesem Grunde zunächst Zurückhaltung ihnen gegenüber auferlegte. Und es muß schon ein sehr gewichtiger Anlaß gewesen sein, der ihn bewog, seine bisherige Politik in so radikaler Weise zu revidieren. Daß die religiöse Fehde zwischen der Handvoll Christen und der großen Menge der Juden der Öffentlichkeit stärker zum Bewußtsein gekommen ist, kann man bezweifeln. Nach der heute vorherrschenden Ansicht mußte ja sogar noch unter Nero die Aufmerksamkeit der Hofkreise erst von außen her auf die Christen gelenkt werden. Viel wahrscheinlicher dürfte es also sein, daß die Juden, wie schon in den Zeiten der Republik, bei den Tumulten in der stets unruhigen Hauptstadt eine wesentliche Rolle gespielt haben.

Hält man nach solchen Vorfällen Ausschau, so hilft uns Tacitus nicht viel weiter. Der Theaterskandal im J. 47 (Ann. 11, 13, 1) ist zu unbestimmt in seinen Umrissen. Auch die Hungerrevolte wenige Jahre später, bei der Claudius selbst auf dem Forum in eine gefährliche Situation geriet (Ann. 12, 43, 1; vgl. Suet. Claud. 18, 2), ist für unsere Zwecke kaum von Bedeutung, obwohl das Ereignis zeitlich in die Nähe des Datums der Judenvertreibung führt (Eusebius setzt die Hungersnot in Rom im J. 50 an; vgl. Ed. Meyer III 166). Die Gründe für die wachsende Unruhe unter den Juden Roms sind vielmehr anderswo zu suchen, und das ermöglicht uns auch, eine Vorstellung von Zielsetzung und Charakter der Bewegung zu gewinnen. Agrippa I. war im J. 44 n. Chr. gestorben. Da die Bevölkerung sich wahrscheinlich als wenig botmäßig erwies, wurde das Land von der römischen Regierung zur Provinz Syrien geschlagen. Tacitus berichtet

darüber unter dem J. 49 (s. zu 12, 23, 1), eine Stelle, auf die mich mein Freund Kenneth Wellesley verweist, der mein Manuskript eingesehen hat. Es kann keinem Zweifel unterliegen, daß dieser Vorgang eine heftige Reaktion beim stadtrömischen Judentum ausgelöst hat. Von nationalistischen Extremisten aufgeputscht, werden die Massen ihrer Empörung immer wieder Ausdruck verliehen haben. Man darf keinen Augenblick dabei aus den Augen verlieren, daß die jüdische Diaspora leidenschaftlich an ihrem Ursprungsland hing und dessen Geschicke mit größter Anteilnahme verfolgte. Nichts ist dafür bezeichnender als die Tatsache, daß nach Jos. ant. 17, 300 die Gesandten, die im J. 4 v. Chr. nach dem Tode des Herodes um Abschaffung des Königtums baten, von über 8000 römischen Juden zum Kaiser geleitet wurden (s. Ed. Meyer III 461).

Wenn ich zusammenfasse, so dürfen wir also an der Suetonstelle, von der wir ausgingen, unter jenem Chrestus eine individuelle Persönlichkeit verstehen, einen Mann also, der bei den Zusammenrottungen der Juden als Einpeitscher und Rädelführer unliebsam in Erscheinung trat. Der Name Chrestus ist nicht ungebräuchlich. Er begegnet Cic. epist. 2, 8, 1. Mart. 7, 55, 1. 9, 27, 1. 14 etc. (Eusebius erwähnt h. e. 10, 5, 2 f. ein Einladungsschreiben des Kaisers Konstantin an Chrestus, Bischof von Syrakus, zum Konzil nach Arles) und häufig auf Inschriften (s. Thes. Onomast. II C p. 407, 72 ff.). Daß die Juden sich griechische Namen beileigten, war im übrigen nichts Ungewöhnliches (vgl. zu den sog. Hebraeern Ed. Meyer III 271, 1). Die Anhänger jenes Chrestus wird das gemeine Volk naturgemäß als *Chrestianos* bezeichnet haben (über Vorkommen von *Chrestianus* außerhalb der christlichen Welt s. Thes. a. a. O. 408, 80 ff.; zur Namensbildung könnte man etwa die *Augustiani* Tac. Ann. 14, 15, 5 und Suet. Nero 25, 1 vergleichen). Deren Charakterisierung Ann. 15, 44, 2 *per flagitia invisos* mag man zunächst gelten lassen, da jene Unruhestifter sich kaum Beliebtheit in Rom verschafft haben. Dabei muß die Frage vorerst offen bleiben, ob Tacitus gemäß seiner gleich zu behandelnden Gesamtkonzeption einen schärferen Ton in seiner Vorlage hineingebracht hat. Immerhin lautet das Urteil des Philosophen Seneca, der sich über die Christen ausgesprochen hat, über die Juden nicht weniger vernichtend, vgl. frg. 41 f. (Zitat bei Aug. civ. dei 6, 11): *cum interim usque eo sceleratissimae gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes iam terras recepta sit; victi victoribus leges dederunt*³.

Es ist noch zu vermerken, daß die Juden unter Nero, der in seiner religiösen Grundhaltung sich wesentlich von seinem Vorgänger unterschied, anscheinend in hellen Scharen nach Rom zurückgekehrt sind: Im Römerbrief 16, 3 entbietet Paulus auch Aquila und Priscilla seinen Gruß. In der seit der Ausweisung unter Claudius verstrichenen Zeit wird beim Volk die Erinnerung an jene *Chrestiani*

³ Vgl. zum letzten Satzstück das berühmte Zitat (aus Strabons Geschichtswerk) über die Juden bei Jos. Ant. 14, 115.

nicht verblaßt sein. Daß Tacitus das Praeteritum *appellabat* wählt, kann nur bedeuten, daß jener Name schon länger im Umlauf war. Endlich dürfen wir nicht vergessen, daß im J. 64 wahrscheinlich die blutigen Ereignisse in Palästina ihre Schatten schon vorauswarfen. Die dadurch auch in Rom bei den Juden hervorgerufene Unruhe wird das Volk von neuem auf sie aufmerksam gemacht haben. Tacitus könnte darüber gemäß seinen sonst zu beobachtenden Prinzipien in einem der späteren Bücher im Zusammenhang mit dem Ausbruch der jüdischen Revolte berichtet haben.

Die von mir vorgenommene Deutung der *Chrestiani*, die im erklärten Gegensatz zu der Auffassung des Tacitus steht, würde den Charakter des Hypothetischen noch nicht verlieren, wenn nicht andere und, wie ich glaube, entscheidende Tatsachen dazu träten. Es ist von jeher aufgefallen, daß die angeblich im ursächlichen Zusammenhang mit dem großen Brand Roms stehenden sog. Christenverfolgungen bis auf die Zeiten des Sulpicius Severus (Anfang des 5. Jahrh.), der den Tacitus ausgeschrieben hat, keinerlei Widerhall in der christlichen Literatur gefunden haben, obwohl das angesichts des grausamen Martyriums der Opfer aufs höchste befremden muß. Weder Melito von Sardes (um 165 n. Chr.), noch Tert. apol. 5. ad nat. 1, 7. scorp. 15, noch Lact. de morte pers. 2, noch endlich Eusebius h. e. 2, 25 verbinden die Christenverfolgungen unter Nero irgendwie mit dem Brand Roms, und auch die Romane vom Märtyrertod des Petrus und Paulus (Anfang des 3. Jahrh.) wissen nichts von solchen Zusammenhängen. Viel gewichtiger ist jedoch noch ein anderer Gesichtspunkt. Die Christen haben sich mit jeder gegen sie erhobenen Beschuldigung, auch der absurdesten, immer wieder nachhaltig auseinandergesetzt und sich bemüht, deren Unrichtigkeit zu erweisen (vgl. Capocci 86 Anm. 29). Und da sollten sie sich gegen den schwersten aller Vorwürfe, nämlich die Hauptstadt des Reiches in Brand gesetzt zu haben, nicht mit äußerster Energie zur Wehr gesetzt haben? Unter diesen Umständen kann ihr völliges Schweigen nur bedeuten, daß die Darstellung des Tacitus des inneren Wahrheitsgehaltes ermangelt. Denn die Kunde von den furchtbaren Vorgängen in Rom als Folge des Riesenbrandes muß sich über die ganze römische Welt verbreitet haben: Wären Christen die alleinigen Opfer gewesen, so würde das auch dem letzten von ihnen zum Bewußtsein gekommen sein.

Doch werfen wir noch einen Blick auf die historische Nebenüberlieferung. Sueton klammere ich aus, da ich auf ihn später eingehen muß. Um so mehr Aufmerksamkeit verdient Cassius Dio, aus dessen großem Werk eine ausführliche Schilderung des Brandes erhalten ist (62, 16 ff.). Leider bricht alsdann aber der Kontext ab, da die Ereignisse nach dem Brand in den Excerpten übergangen worden sind. Aber gerade darin liegt ein sicheres Indiz. Hätte im dionysischen Original etwas von Christenverfolgungen gestanden, würden die byzan-

tinischen, also christlichen Epitomatoren begierig danach gegriffen haben (unbegreiflich Ed. Meyer III 500, 3: „In den Auszügen ist sie“, nämlich die Christenverfolgung, „übergangen; er selbst wird jedenfalls davon berichtet haben“). Dio wird als heidnischer Historiker nicht alles registriert haben, was die Christen betraf: Im vorliegenden Fall aber hätte er diese bei der Schilderung der Exekutionen Neros zweifellos namhaft gemacht, wenn seine Darstellung sich inhaltlich mit derjenigen des Tacitus berührte.

Es ist nun an der Zeit, daß wir uns letzterem zuwenden. Der Schlüssel zum Verständnis seines Berichtes und der diesem innewohnenden Tendenzen ist nach meiner Überzeugung im Paragraphen 3 enthalten. Was er dort ausführt, ist auf den ersten Blick als Einschub in die eigentliche Erzählung zu erkennen. Wir tun gut daran, ihn gesondert zu betrachten.

Tacitus war bekanntlich um 112 n. Chr. Statthalter der Provinz Asien. Gewiß ist er damals in noch weit höherem Maß als sein Freund Plinius, der ungefähr zur gleichen Zeit in Bithynien amtierte, mit den Christen in Berührung gekommen (so wohl als erster K. Cichorius bei Ed. Norden, Josephus und Tacitus, Leipzig-Berlin 1913, 15 f.). Und wenn jener an Kaiser Trajan epist. 10, 96, 1 schreibt: *cognitionibus de Christianis interfui numquam: ideo nescio, quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri*, so könnte Ähnliches auch für Tacitus gelten, der unter Domitian längere Zeit von Rom abwesend war und als Proprätor in einer Provinz – wir wissen nicht, in welcher – Dienste leistete. Jedenfalls stoßen wir in den Historien, die vor sein Prokonsulat fallen, im Judenexkurs V 1 ff. auf kein Wort über die Christen, wie es andernfalls wohl zu erwarten gewesen wäre⁴. Als er nun in Kleinasien mit den Anhängern der christlichen Heilslehre konfrontiert wurde, hat er anscheinend mit härterer Hand als Plinius zugegriffen. Da er mit diesem sicherlich in brieflichem Kontakt stand und ihm auch der kaiserliche Kabinettsbeschluß (Plin. epist. 10, 97) zugeleitet wurde, wie man annehmen darf, müssen Gründe besonderer Art vorgelegen

⁴ Nach Sulpic. Sev. Chron. II 30, 7f. hatte Titus im Kriegsrat die Zerstörung des Tempels in Jerusalem mit der Begründung vorgeschlagen, *quo plenius Iudaeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur: quippe has religiones, licet contrarias sibi, isdem tamen ab auctoribus projectas; Christianos ex Iudaeis extitisse: radice sublata stirpem facile perituram. ita Dei nutu accensis omnium animis templum dirutum*. Angesichts des überall auch sonst zu beobachtenden Gegensatzes zu der Schilderung des Josephus im Bellum Iudaicum hatte Jac. Bernays als Quelle des Sulpicius Severus das 5. Buch der Historien des Tacitus vermutet. Das ist für die oben angeführten Sätze unmöglich (vgl. Weynand, RE VI 2703), einmal wegen des ganz im christlichen Geist erfolgten Hinweises auf das unerbittliche Strafgericht Gottes über Jerusalem. Zum anderen, und das ist fast noch wichtiger: Wenn auch Tacitus den Prinzen in gleicher Weise wie Sulpicius hätte argumentieren lassen, wäre unter allen Umständen eine vorausgehende Erläuterung der *secta Christianorum* im erhaltenen allgemeinen Teil V 1 ff. erforderlich gewesen.

haben, die ihn veranlaßten, sein Urteil über die Christen in so scharf zugespitzter negativer Fassung abzugeben, wie es in den oben zitierten Worten *per flagitia invisos*, die man als symptomatisch ansehen kann, geschehen ist. Hatte doch Plinius bei seinen Untersuchungen keine *flagitia* in Erfahrung bringen können: *nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam, immodicam*, schreibt er epist. 10, 96, 8 an den Kaiser. Um demgegenüber die von Grund aus abweichende Einstellung des Tacitus verständlich zu machen, genügt es nicht, auf seine überall zu beobachtende Abneigung gegen alles Orientalische zu verweisen. Antipathie oder gar Verachtung reichen für sich allein nicht aus, um bei einem Mann, der seiner ganzen Natur nach nicht zur *saevitia* neigte, die überaus scharfe Frontstellung gerade gegenüber den Christen plausibel zu machen.

Da verdanke ich Kenneth Wellesley den Hinweis, daß möglicherweise die Kenntnisnahme der Apokalypse von bestimmendem Einfluß auf Tacitus gewesen ist. Man pflegt diese Schrift in der Zeit nach Domitian und vor 130 anzusetzen. Sie war gerichtet an die 7 Städte Asiens unter Einschluß der Hauptstadt Ephesos. Die Tendenz ist bekanntlich vehement antirömisch: cap. 18, 8 heißt es von „Babylon“ als der großen Hure, „mit Feuer wird sie verbrannt werden“. Solche und ähnliche Formulierungen hätten in der Tat auf Tacitus, wenn sie ihm bekannt wurden, alarmierend wirken müssen. Und der Eindruck konnte sich bei ihm verstärken, daß es sich bei den Christen um eine im hohen Maß staatsgefährliche Sekte handele. Man könnte noch einen Schritt weiter gehen und folgern, daß die Anspielungen auf Nero (oder den falschen Nero) Tacitus „sufficient reason“ gaben, „to introduce the hostile allusion to the Christians into Annals XV“ (Wellesley).

Wie dem auch sei, seine damals in Asien gewonnenen Erkenntnisse haben offensichtlich an unserer Stelle Ann. 15, 44, 2 ihren Niederschlag gefunden (vgl. auch § 5 *adversus sontes et novissima exempla meritos*). Da ist es nun von Bedeutung, daß die vulgäre Umformung des Christennamens zu *Chrestiani* im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert weite Kreise gezogen hat, wogegen sich Tert. apol. 3 und ad nat. 1, 3 nachdrücklich verwahrt (vgl. auch Lact. inst. 4, 7, 4. Justin. apol. 1, 3. Theoph. ad Autol. 1, 1).

Unter diesen Umständen drängt sich der Verdacht auf, daß Tacitus, als er in seiner Vorlage auf die *Chrestiani* stieß, diese fälschlich mit den Christen gleichgesetzt hat. Dadurch mußte naturgemäß eine gänzlich abwegige Note in seinen Bericht hineingeraten. Ob er bereits im 5. Buch der Annalen, das von den Ereignissen der Jahre 29–31 handelte, auf den Kreuzestod Christi eingegangen ist, bleibt zweifelhaft. Auffällig ist an unserer Stelle, daß der Amtsbezirk des Pontius Pilatus nicht näher umrissen wird⁵, wie denn das ganze

⁵ Andresen war der Ansicht, daß dies durch nachfolgendes *per Iudaeam* zur Genüge geschehen sei. Völlig zwingend ist diese Erklärung indessen nicht. Jedenfalls setzt der Wort-

Kapitel anscheinend gewisse Anzeichen einer fehlenden letzten Überarbeitung aufweist. Eine Rückverweisung auf jenes frühere Buch wäre freilich kaum zu erwarten gewesen, da es zeitlich zu lange zurücklag (so wird etwa die Giftmischerin Locusta 13, 15, 3, wohl bedingt durch die Zäsur nach Buch 12, ganz neu eingeführt, als ob sie 12, 66, 2 noch garnicht genannt worden sei). Es ist im übrigen, um das wenigstens anzudeuten, nicht undenkbar, daß der Verlust des größten Teiles von Buch 5 einem Mönch zuzuschreiben ist, der an der Art schweren Anstoß nahm, wie Tacitus die geheiligte Person Christi verächtlich gemacht hatte.

Der Exkurs § 3 bekundet nach Inhalt und Formgebung alle Eigenheiten des taciteischen Gestaltungswillens, so daß keinerlei Zweifel an der Echtheit des gesamten Abschnittes zulässig ist. Das verrät sich besonders am Schluß durch die sallustianische Wendung *non modo per Iudaeam, originem eius mali, sed per urbem etiam* (die Auslassung der geographischen Zwischenglieder ist typisch taciteische Abbréviation), *quo cuncta undique atrocita aut pudenda conflunt celebranturque* (auch die Unterstreichung durch die Assonanz ist in hohem Maß bezeichnend für Tacitus).

Mit § 4 wird die in § 3 unterbrochene Erzählung wiederaufgenommen: Tacitus kehrt zu seiner Vorlage (vielleicht Plinius d. Ä.) zurück. Im folgenden ist fast jedes Wort in der modernen Forschung heftig umstritten. Sollte der Grund darin zu suchen sein, daß der Historiker infolge seiner gewaltsamen Umdeutung des Geschehens den Anschluß an die zugrunde liegende Darstellung nur unvollkommen herzustellen vermochte? So gibt bereits der einleitende Satz Rätsel auf, da er, wie er jetzt dasteht, in der Luft hängt: *igitur primum correpti, qui fatebantur*. Wer hat „gestanden“ – wirkliche Übeltäter, was nach § 2 *reos subdidit* wenig wahrscheinlich wäre, oder Agenten Neros, die auf sein Geheiß das Feuer angelegt hätten und nunmehr vorgeschoben wurden, um andere zu bezichtigen, oder aber zielt das Ganze auf ein Bekenntnis zum Christentum, als Quintessenz von § 3? Alle drei Thesen haben Anhänger gefunden. Aber anscheinend hat Tacitus den Ausdruck unbestimmt gelassen, weil möglicherweise nicht in sein Konzept paßte, was in seiner Vorlage klar zum Ausdruck kam (dazu Wellesley: „The vague *fatebantur* seems to me very characteristic of Tacitus when he has to paper over the cracks in his narrative or reconcile conflicting versions“).

Aufhorchen läßt auch das nächste Satzstück, das wenigstens kurz berührt werden soll: *multitudo ingens haud proinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani*

laut voraus, daß der Name des Pilatus dem Leser der Annalen nicht unbekannt war. Übrigens hat man neuerdings die Auffassung vertreten, Pilatus habe den Titel eines *praefectus* getragen, da die Amtsbezeichnung *procurator* für Statthalter im Ritterrang erst seit Claudius aufgekomen sei (s. P. A. Brunt, Latomus 25, 1966, 463).

generis convicti (so L; auf die Lesart von M *conIuncti* werde ich wie auf alles andere im Kommentar eingehen). Das letztere Kolon erinnert inhaltlich sofort an die Aussage im Judenexkurs Hist. V 5, 1 *adversus omnes alios hostile odium*. Waren also die unglücklichen Opfer der kaiserlichen Lynchjustiz nicht die Christen für sich gesondert, sondern extrem nationalistische Teile des Judenvolkes⁶?

Dem würde sich gut einfügen, daß der Riesenbrand seinen Ausgang am Circus maximus nahm, wo gewiß auch zahlreiche jüdische Händler ihren Stand hatten⁷, die man jetzt als die Sündenböcke zuerst zur Verantwortung zog. Das erste Feuer, das in einer Vollmondnacht ausbrach (am 19. Juli 64), kann, vielleicht im Gegensatz zum zweiten, nicht Nero zur Last gelegt werden, da dieser zu jener Zeit in Antium weilte (vgl. 15, 39, 1). Denn Voraussetzung für die rapide Geschwindigkeit, mit der sich der Brand ausdehnte, und für die Richtung, die er nahm, war, daß ein heftiger Schirokko wehte. Das aber ließ sich schwerlich vorausberechnen. Da der Gedanke an Selbstentzündung wohl ausscheidet, kann die Ursache des Brandes nur auf unvorsichtiges Hantieren mit Feuer in den mit leichtentzündlichen Gegenständen angefüllten Verkaufsbuden (vgl. 15, 38, 2) zurückgeführt werden, wie das ja ähnlich bei den verheerenden Föhnkatastrophen im Alpengebiet der Fall gewesen ist. Die Besitzer jener Buden am Zirkus, die durch ihre Fahrlässigkeit das Unheil heraufbeschworen hatten, konnten alsdann ausfindig gemacht werden, und so erklärt sich noch am ehesten das ominöse Satzstück *qui fatebantur*, – wenigstens für die Vorlage des Tacitus. Wenn sich unter diesen Personen jüdische *Chrestiani* befanden, die sich in jener Zeit, wie weiter oben ausgeführt wurde, durch Äußerungen politischer Unzufriedenheit verdächtig gemacht hatten, so genügte das, um ein

⁶ Im apokryphen Briefwechsel des Apostels Paulus mit Seneca epist. 11 Barlow 134, dem einzigen sonstigen Schriftstück, das einen ursächlichen Zusammenhang zwischen dem Brand Roms und den Verfolgungen herstellt, werden von Seneca Christen und Juden als Opfer Neros, *quasi machinatores incendii*, aufgeführt (s. A. Momigliano, *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, Roma 1955, 13–22). Wenn auch die Briefsammlung als Ganzes eine fromme Erfindung ist (A. Kurfess, *Mnemosyne* 6, 1938, 265 ff., setzt sie, gewiß zu früh, Mitte des 2. Jahrh. an; anscheinend richtiger Barlow 82 Mitte des 3. oder gar des 4. Jahrh.), so muß doch der Verfasser authentisches Material benutzt haben. Die Briefe 10–14 sind datiert. Da in unserem Brief die Cognomina der amtierenden Konsuln genannt sind, die bei Tacitus fehlen, kann der Autor kaum auf diesen zurückgegriffen haben (anders Barlow 83). Sollte sich bei dem Verweis auf Christen und Juden ein Stück echter Überlieferung gehalten haben? Bemerkenswert ist immerhin, daß nach dem Brief Paulus von der Verfolgung im J. 64 nicht betroffen wäre.

⁷ In unmittelbarer Nähe des Circus an der Porta Capena befand sich eine Niederlassung der Juden, über deren Armseligkeit Juvenal sat. 3, 13 seine Glossen macht. Es waren kleine Krämer, die sich mühsam ihren Lebensunterhalt beschafften. Übrigens sind in der Nähe auch jüdische Katakomben aufgedeckt worden (vgl. Ed. Meyer III 461, 5).

Pogrom zu entfesseln. Auf das *indicium* jener Männer gestützt, konnte man den Kreis der „Schuldigen“ unschwer immer mehr ausweiten.

Ich füge nur noch hinzu, daß der Ausdruck *multitudo ingens*, auch wenn er rhetorisch übersteigert sein sollte, nur unter der Voraussetzung sinnvoll zu sein scheint, daß man an die sehr große Zahl der in Rom ansässigen Juden, nicht aber an die damals ihrem Umfang nach noch sehr kleine Christengemeinde denkt. Es ist aufschlußreich, daß weder bei Seneca d. J., noch bei Martial, noch endlich erstaunlicherweise auch bei Juvenal, der sich doch höchst ingrimmig und sarkastisch mit den Juden befaßt hat (vgl. sat. 3, 13 ff. 6, 542 ff. 14, 99 ff.), der Name der Christen fällt, obwohl letzterer anscheinend sat. 1, 155 ff. auf die lebenden Fackeln Neros im Zusammenhang mit dem Gardepräfekten Tigellinus anspielt.

Aus dem Gesagten ergibt sich also als die wahrscheinlichste Lösung des gewiß sehr schwierigen Problems: Tacitus hat in den ihm vorliegenden Bericht, dem er § 2 und §§ 4 f. mit gewissen Einschränkungen folgt, seinen eigenen Exkurs § 3 eingeschoben, dessen Inhalt und Tendenz die wirklichen Zusammenhänge verfälschen. Da sein Irrtum psychologisch immerhin verständlich wäre, brauchte man mit ihm nicht zu streng ins Gericht zu gehen. Aber er hätte durch seine Autorität und die Suggestionskraft seiner Erzählung bewirkt, daß die Legende von der Christenverfolgung im J. 64 durch die Jahrhunderte hindurch bis zur Gegenwart Geltung behalten hat.

Nun bleibt freilich noch übrig, das Augenmerk auf Suet. Nero 16, 2 zu richten: *afflicti suppliciiis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae* (vgl. Ann. 15, 44, 3 *exitiabilis superstitio*). Daß die Notiz beim Biographen isoliert ist und in keine ursächliche Verbindung mit dem Brand gebracht wird, ist an sich kein Indiz, da er sein Material überall säuberlich auf verschiedene Rubriken verteilt hat: In unserem Fall ist das *incendium* unter den *mala facinora* Neros, den er ja für den Schuldigen hält, eingeordnet worden (cap. 38 ff.), während die Hinrichtung der Christen als lobenswerte Tat des Kaisers hingestellt wird. Aber das Problem liegt tiefer. Im Zusammenhang mit dem qualvollen Martyrium der Opfer des J. 64 ist immer wieder auf den Tod der Aposteln Petrus und Paulus verwiesen worden. Was letzteren angeht, so steht fest, mögen seine letzten Lebensschicksale auch sonst in Dunkel gehüllt sein, daß er durch das Beil hingerichtet wurde⁸. Galt auch für ihn das *crimen*

⁸ Paulus mußte sich im J. 60 nach Rom begeben, um sich dort zu verantworten. Er blieb in der Hauptstadt zwei Jahre (Acta apost. 18, 17–31). „Möglicherweise ist er freigesprochen worden und hat wieder reisen und wirken können, hat Spanien besucht und auch den Osten wiedergesehen. Aber das kann Legende sein“, urteilt H. Lietzmann, Gesch. der alten Kirche, Berlin⁸ 1953, I 111. – Viel hängt davon ab, ob sich ein Beweis für die Echtheit der sog. Pastoralbriefe erbringen läßt, die von einer späteren, wesentlich verschärften Haft

der Brandstiftung, hätte ihn sein römisches Bürgerrecht schwerlich davor bewahrt, wie die übrigen Opfer einem raffiniert grausamen Tode ausgeliefert zu werden: Die römische Strafjustiz kannte gegenüber *incendiarii* kein Erbarmen, ob es sich nun um einen römischen Bürger oder Nichtbürger handelte, und erst recht nicht bei einem Geschehen von so ungeheuren Ausmaßen wie dem vorliegenden Fall. Daß der Vorwurf der Brandstiftung von Nero nur vorgetäuscht wurde, ist dabei ohne Belang: Er diente jedenfalls als Grundlage der Strafverfolgung.

Die Enthauptung des Paulus wird auf dem römischen Schindanger *extra portam Esquilinam* (s. zu 2, 32, 3) stattgefunden haben. Damit ließe sich vereinbaren, daß seine Gebeine nach der Tradition an der Via Ostiensis beigesetzt wurden. Da der Leichnam von den Exekutionsbehörden nicht freigegeben, sondern von den Schergen verscharrt wurde, ist ungewiß, wie seine Glaubensgenossen in dessen Besitz gelangt sind. Wie im Fall des Apostels Petrus könnten die Christen die Stelle durch einen Cippus bezeichnet und die leiblichen Reste später heimlich, um sie zu bestatten, ausgegraben haben.

Nun wird der Tod der beiden Apostel von Eusebius in seiner Chronik auf das Jahr 68 (oder 67) angesetzt, also auf die letzten Jahre Neros. „Das hat Hieronymus übernommen, dagegen den von Eusebius übergangenen Brand richtig unter dem J. 64 eingefügt“ (Ed. Meyer III 501, 3). Gegen jenen zeitlichen Ansatz hat sich Ad. von Harnack, Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius, Leipzig 1897, I 240 ff., der die Notiz des Eusebius auf die Chronik des Africanus zurückführt, mit insgesamt kaum durchschlagenden Argumenten gewandt. Das über den Tod des Paulus Gesagte dürfte den Schluß aufnötigen, daß das Martyrium der beiden großen Apostel nicht im Zusammenhang mit den Verfolgungen des J. 64 steht. Daß das Tropaeum des Petrus beim Vatikan, also in der Nähe der Gärten Neros, die jenes schreckliche Schauspiel sahen, errichtet wurde (Euseb. h. e. 2, 25, 7), beweist nichts gegen die obige Folgerung, da dort auch später unter dem fünften Kaiser Blutgerichte erfolgt sein können. Es wäre also denkbar, daß Suet. Nero 16, 2 auf sonst nicht weiter kenntliche Ereignisse der allerletzten Zeit Neros, die vielleicht durch die Erhebung der

künden. Soweit ich sehe, hat als letzter zu den Problemen kurz Stellung genommen J. N. Sevenster, Biblisch-Hist. Handwörterbuch III, Göttingen 1966, Sp. 1404 f.: „Über das Lebensende des Paulus wissen wir aus dem NT nichts mit Gewißheit. Aus der späteren Überlieferung ist aber ziemlich sicher, daß er als Märtyrer gestorben ist, sei es z. Z. der Verfolgung Neros 64 n. Chr., sei es nach einem Todesurteil durch das Schwert hingerichtet (I. Clem. 5, 5–7. Acta Pauli 10. Tert. adv. haer. 36. Lact. de morte pers. 2. Chrys. 33. Homilie zum Römerbrief 2. Aug. Joh. 47, 12. Eus. h. e. 2, 25, 5–8)“. Daß die Apostel Petrus und Paulus in Rom ihren Tod fanden, kann heute nicht mehr bezweifelt werden (s. Lietzmann a. a. O. 201; ferner: Petrus und Paulus in Rom, 1927), auch wenn die Ausgrabungen unter der Peterskirche noch kein eindeutiges Ergebnis gezeitigt haben sollten.

Juden in Palästina ausgelöst wurden, zu beziehen ist und nicht auf den Brand Roms. Im übrigen brauchen die Worte *superstitio nova ac malefica* bei ihm nicht zu bedeuten, daß der Biograph den Tacitus eingesehen hat, da es nur wenige und umstrittene Hinweise dafür gibt, daß er letzteren benutzt hat: Da er unter Hadrian schrieb, entsprach das Urteil, das in jenen Worten zum Ausdruck kommt, der damals herrschenden landläufigen Meinung.

Endlich müssen wir noch ein Zeugnis untersuchen, das bei der Diskussion des taciteischen Kapitels immer wieder große Beachtung gefunden und auf dem noch jüngst Capocci 80 Anm. 28 insistiert hat, nämlich den ersten Clemensbrief, der auf das Jahr 96 datiert wird. In seinem Schreiben an die korinthische Gemeinde spricht der Verfasser cap. 5 f. von den Verfolgungen, denen die Christen Roms „in seiner Generation“ ausgesetzt gewesen seien. Zeitlich werden diese eng mit dem Tod der beiden Apostelfürsten verknüpft, gedacht ist auch hier eindeutig an die Regierung Neros. Nach Clemens war die Zahl der Opfer groß, *πολὸν πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν*, worin man einen Hinweis auf die *multitudo ingens* bei Tacitus gesehen hat. Auch fehlte es nicht an *ludibria*: *πολλὰς ἀκρίας καὶ βασάνους παθόντες*. Damit sind aber die Übereinstimmungen erschöpft. Denn was Clemens im einzelnen über die Mißhandlungen von Christenfrauen berichtet, fügt sich in keiner Weise der taciteischen Schilderung ein. Mit Recht hat daher H. Dessau, Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, Berlin 1926, II 1, 230 Anm. 5, davor gewarnt, jene Angaben auf die Vorgänge des J. 64 zu beziehen. Er bemerkt insbesondere zu den „Danaiden“: „Und das soll der schlichte Verfasser jenes Briefes aus so viel Gräßlichem als das Gräßlichste herausgehoben haben. Die Warnung von Moritz Haupt, Hermes 3, 1869, 145 = Opusc. 3, 398 hat keine Beachtung gefunden“. Diese durch den gesunden Menschenverstand gebotene Zurückweisung einer These, die immer wieder durch die Literatur geistert, scheint auch mir die einzig mögliche Auslegung zu sein. Damit entfällt aber auch das letzte Argument, das dafür sprechen könnte, die furchtbaren Geschehnisse des J. 64 hätten in der christlichen Literatur irgendeinen Widerhall gefunden. In Wahrheit steht also Tacitus mit seiner alarmierenden These völlig allein. Schwerlich hat er damit, um noch einmal das Fazit meiner Untersuchungen zu ziehen, den wirklichen Tatsachen Rechnung getragen.

Anhangsweise muß noch zweierlei gesagt werden:

1. Man hat stets von neuem die Vermutung geäußert, Poppaea, die Beziehungen zum Judentum unterhielt (vgl. Jos. ant. 20, 195 *θεοσεβῆς γὰρ ἦν*. vit. 16), und mit ihr Tigellinus hätten, von den Juden angestiftet, die Aufmerksamkeit Neros auf die Christen gelenkt. Ich wundere mich, daß man dabei den einflußreichen (vgl. Ann. 15, 55, 1) Freigelassenen Neros Epaphroditus, der das Amt *a libellis* bekleidete und seinem Herrn bis zu dessen trostlosem Tod die

Treue hielt (Suet. Nero 49, 3), unberücksichtigt gelassen hat. War es doch Epaphroditus, der Josephus ermunterte, seine jüdische Archaeologie zu schreiben. Aber ich glaube nicht, daß man bei solchen Spekulationen festen Boden unter den Füßen gewinnt.

2. Das von mir vorgelegte Material nötigt zu dem Schluß, daß die Annalen des Tacitus nach seinem Ableben nur sehr wenig Resonanz gefunden haben. Offenbar hat neben der Bevorzugung des biographischen Genos die unter Hadrian einsetzende archaische Reaktion dazu geführt, daß sein großes Geschichtswerk bald weitgehend in Vergessenheit geraten ist, wobei überdies persönliches Ressentiment eine nicht unerhebliche Rolle gespielt haben könnte. Denn nur so ist es zu erklären, daß das sog. Christenkapitel in der gesamten christlichen Literatur der ersten Jahrhunderte unbeachtet geblieben ist⁹. Die Renaissance des Historikers setzt anscheinend erst wieder mit Kaiser Tacitus (275 n. Chr.) ein, der Sorge trug, daß die Schriften seines Namensvetters (oder gar Verwandten), *ne lectorum incuria deperiret*, vervielfältigt und in den Bibliotheken aufgestellt wurden (vgl. HA. vita Tac. 10, 3)¹⁰. Doch muß einschränkend gesagt werden, daß die Zahl der Apographa kaum sehr groß gewesen sein kann, da der Kaiser nur sehr kurze Zeit regierte und die Arbeit nach seinem Tode vielleicht eingestellt wurde. Immerhin steht mit jenem Faktum in Einklang, daß eine Benutzung der Schriften des Tacitus eindeutig erst wieder im 4. Jahrhundert nachweisbar ist.

Kiel

ERICH KOESTERMANN

⁹ Tertullian kannte ihn. Apol. 16 apostrophiert er ihn mit den Worten: *Cornelius Tacitus sane ille mendaciorum loquacissimus* (Wortspiel mit dem Namen?). Das kann sich nur auf Hist. V beziehen. Hätte er von Ann. 15, 44 Kunde besessen, würde er sich mit aller Kraft gegen den Vorwurf der Brandstiftung verwahrt haben.

¹⁰ E. Hohl, Hermes 55, 1920, 300ff., glaubte, daß es sich bei den zitierten Worten um eine Fälschung aus der Zeit des Symmachus handle, der als *praefectus urbi* im J. 384 (als solcher hatte er auch die Aufsicht über die Bibliotheken) dafür sorgte, daß die alten Autoren, nicht zuletzt die Historiker, in revidierter Fassung neu ediert wurden (s. auch Ed. Norden, Alt-Germanien, Leipzig-Berlin 1934, 36 Anm. 1). Ob Hohl mit dieser Deutung das Richtige getroffen hat, ist mir zweifelhaft, da ich aus Gründen, auf die ich hier nicht eingehen kann, dem Kaiser Tacitus das Zeugnis belassen möchte. Wäre Hohl im Recht, käme man freilich noch näher an die Zeiten, in denen das Andenken des Tacitus mit Sicherheit wieder lebendig wurde.



Antoninus Pius and the Control of Provincial Embassies

Author(s): W. Williams

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Sep., 1967, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967), pp. 470-483

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435005>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

ANTONINUS PIUS AND THE CONTROL OF PROVINCIAL EMBASSIES

One of the forms of conspicuous expenditure in which the Greek cities of the East indulged was the despatch of ambassadors to the emperor provided with generous allowances.¹ Such envoys frequently had only formal tasks to perform, such as delivering messages of greeting or decrees which honoured a Roman official or a local citizen: the most notorious example is the annual embassy from Byzantium to which Pliny put a stop.² During the second century A.D. the emperors became concerned about the extravagance and financial inefficiency of the cities: this concern is illustrated by Pliny's mission to Bithynia and the appointment of *curatores*.³ One would expect the emperors to clamp down on a form of extravagance which they could see with their own eyes, and for which respect for their own persons may have supplied an excuse.

Vespasian is the first emperor who is recorded to have limited such embassies: in an edict he laid down that no embassy should have more than three members.⁴ Later, Trajan approved Pliny's plan to stop Byzantium from sending embassies each year to greet the emperor and the legate of Moesia Inferior.⁵ There is, however, no other direct evidence for restrictions on embassies being imposed by the emperors, but there is indirect evidence in the texts of imperial replies addressed to the cities. The purpose of this note is to use these texts to show that Antoninus Pius alone was successful in curbing this form of civic extravagance.

There have survived from the period between Vespasian and Caracalla⁶ the texts of sixty-one imperial replies⁷ addressed to provincial councils, cities or

¹ See A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City*, p. 135 and p. 243, and W. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche*, pp. 82–88.

² Plin., Epp. X. 43. Cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny*, p. 626.

³ See Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 135–138, and D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, chapters 25–27.

⁴ Digest L. vii. 5. 6.

⁵ Plin., Epp. X. 44. Cf. X. 83, where Nicaea asks Pliny to forward a petition to Trajan.

⁶ The reign of Vespasian provides a convenient starting-point for this survey, because he is the first emperor known to have imposed a restriction on embassies (see note 4). After the reign of Caracalla, the evidence, which is almost wholly epigraphic, is lacking for the rest of the third century.

⁷ The references to these documents will be given as they are discussed. There are two groups of letters which have naturally not been taken into account: –

civic bodies.⁸ In ten cases out of the sixty-one one cannot tell whether the original message had been brought to the emperor by an embassy or forwarded by the provincial governor.⁹ In the remaining fifty-one cases, thirty-five messages had been brought by embassies and sixteen had been forwarded. The striking fact is that all but one of the sixteen date from the reign of Pius:¹⁰ no example of a forwarded message occurs before Pius' reign, and only one afterwards, in the reign of Severus. Unsupported by other evidence this fact would not prove that Pius imposed restrictions on the despatch of embassies. It could

- (a) Those which are clearly not replies to messages. Hadrian: IG. II/III.² 1102 = E. M. Smallwood, *Documents of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian*, no. 445; Perdrizet, *BCH*. XXI (1897), p. 162 = Abbott and Johnson, *Municipal Administration*, no. 79; Syll.³ 838. Antoninus Pius: IG. VII. 2870 = Abbott and Johnson, *op. cit.*, no. 104, II. 1–5.
- (b) Those whose texts are damaged so that one cannot tell whether they are replies or not. Trajan: IGRR. IV. 337 and 351, II. 6–12. Hadrian: IG. II/III.² 1103 = Smallwood, *op. cit.*, no. 444; IGRR. IV. 351, II. 21–25, and 350a, II. 7–21; E. Bourguet, *De rebus Delphicis imperatoriae aetatis*, pp. 74–75 and pp. 76–77; Ann. Ep. 1948. 52. Antoninus Pius: IGRR. IV. 357; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, pp. 88–89. Marcus and Commodus: IG. II/III.² 1108, with J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia*, suppl. vol. VI (1941), nos. 24–25, pp. 109ff., and with B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* XXX (1961), no. 31, pp. 231–6 = SEG. XXI. 509. Commodus: IG. II/III.² 1109, with A. E. Raubitschek, *Hesperia*, suppl. vol. VIII (1949), pp. 286–290; IG. II/III.² 1112, with J. H. Oliver, *loc. cit.*, no. 26, and with B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*. XXIX (1960), no. 29, p. 22 = SEG. XIX. 114.

⁸ All the letters to provincial councils are from Antoninus Pius, and all are addressed to the *koinon* of Lycia, with the exception of one letter to the *koinon* of Asia (Hicks, *Inscriptions of the British Museum* III. 493 = W. Hüttel, *Antoninus Pius* II, pp. 354–355). The Lycian *koinon* retained from the days of the independent Lycian confederation a tradition of lively activity, and the documents from the tomb of Opramoas show that it acted in close cooperation with the individual cities in sending embassies to the emperor. It can thus be treated for our purposes as equivalent to the city governments, which were elsewhere the dominant units of local autonomy. Some semi-official bodies within the cities, which sent embassies to the emperors in the same way as the city governments, can be treated in the same way, e.g., the *neoi* of Pergamon (Syll.³ 831), and the *gerousia* of Ephesos (Syll.³ 833). Letters to other bodies, such as that of Pius to the Panhellenion (OGIS. II. 506), have not been taken into consideration.

⁹ There is only one of these ten letters the full text of which has been preserved, that of Titus to Munigua (A. d'Ors, *Emerita* XXIX (1961), p. 208 = Ann. Ep. 1962. 147 = 288). Three letters from Hadrian, Pius and Marcus to Antinoopolis are quoted in excerpt in a papyrus (P. Würzburg 9, II. 28–52, published by Wilcken, *APAW.*, 1933, Heft 6, pp. 60–71). The other six letters in this group are preserved on fragmentary inscriptions, so that one cannot tell whether or not they contained a reference to an embassy or to a message which had been forwarded: – Hadrian: Bourguet, *op. cit.*, pp. 78–79; Syll.³ 832. Antoninus Pius: IGRR. III. 467. Marcus Aurelius: IG. II/III.² 1108, with J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia*, suppl. vol. VI (1941), no. 24, II. 24–39. Severus and Caracalla: IGRR. IV. 1014. Caracalla: J. Keil and G. Maresch, *JOAI* XLV (1960), Beiblatt, pp. 80–82, no. 7, II. 15–22.

¹⁰ See Table 1. The exception is Severus' letter to Nikopolis (Ann. Ep. 1926. 95).

be dismissed as a statistical vagary, since the total of surviving replies by Pius is larger than that of any other emperor in this period: twenty-five as against fifteen by Hadrian, and Hadrian's total in turn is much higher than those of other emperors.¹¹ Further-more, ten of the fifteen messages forwarded to Pius come from one monument and deal with the honours voted to one man, Opramoas of Rhodiapolis.¹²

However, an examination of the form and content of imperial replies shows that there had been an attempt to discourage the despatch of unnecessary embassies in Hadrian's reign; this had failed and Pius resorted to direct restrictions. A large number of imperial replies end with one of two standard formulae, immediately followed by the final greeting:¹³ one formula records that the message had been forwarded by the provincial governor or the procurator;¹⁴ the other gives the names of the ambassadors who had brought the message to the emperor.¹⁵ In some letters there is a rider to this latter formula to say that the ambassadors should be paid their expenses unless they had undertaken to go on the embassy at their own expense.¹⁶ The rider is first found in the letters of

¹¹ See Table 1.

¹² TAM. II. 905 (= IGRR. III. 739), sections 42, 44 and 46–51. The other two messages are mentioned in decrees of the *koinon* (ibid., sections 32 and 55); the emperor's replies to these messages were probably on parts of the inscription now damaged (ibid., sections 39 and 41).

¹³ All the letters which are replies to messages which have been forwarded refer to this fact (see the documents referred to in notes 10 and 12, and also Syll.³ 849 and 850, IBM. III. 492 and 493). Replies to embassies are classified according to whether they contain the standard formula, other formulae or fragmentary references in Table 2.

¹⁴ τὸ ψήφισμα ἐπεμψεν ὁ δεῖνα, ὁ κράτιστος ἀνθύπατος (Syll.³ 850), or ὁ κράτιστος τοῦ ἔθνους ἡγεμῶν (TAM. II. 905, sections 44 and 46–51), or ὁ κράτιστος φίλος ἡμῶν καὶ πρεσβευτῆς (Ann. Ep. 1926. 95), or ἐπίτροπός μου (Syll.³ 849).

¹⁵ In the reigns of Domitian and of Trajan, and early in Hadrian's, it took the form ὁ πρεσβευτῆς (or πρεσβεύων, Syll.³ 833), followed by the ambassador's name, with or without ἦν (McCrum and Woodhead, *Documents of the Flavian Emperors*, no. 463; Bourguet, op. cit., p. 70, II. 7–8 and II. 17–18; ibid., p. 72, I. 11; and Syll.³ 833). From the middle of Hadrian's reign onwards a new form appears: the imperfect or the aorist of the verb πρεσβεύειν, followed by the name or names of the ambassador(s); the earliest examples date from 127 A.D. (IGRR. IV. 1156, revised by Robert, *Hellenica* VI, pp. 81–82) and 131–2 (IGRR. IV. 351, II. 18–21 = 350a, II. 2–6). A corresponding formula in Latin occurs once, in a letter of Vespasian: "egerunt legati", followed by the ambassadors' names (CIL. X. 8038 = FIRA. I.² 72).

¹⁶ An earlier and more elaborate form of the rider seems to have passed out of use after Hadrian's accession: it is known only from the fragmentary texts of the replies of Domitian and of Trajan to Delphi. Besides the imperative of the later form there was some expression which indicated that the envoys deserved to be rewarded (πρε]σβείας ἀξίους κρε[... , McCrum and Woodhead, op. cit., 463, I. 5; τῆς] πρεσβείας ἀξίον κρεῖνω, Bourguet, op. cit., p. 70, I. 18.). From Hadrian's accession the form was simpler: ὃ δοθήτω τὸ ἐφόδιον εἰ μὴ

Domitian and Trajan to Delphi,¹⁷ and in these letters the formula is in each case accompanied by the rider.¹⁸ But in some of Hadrian's letters the formula occurs without the rider. Ulpian used the following words to say that civic ambassadors were entitled to their expenses: "his qui non gratuitam legationem susceperunt legativum ex forma restituitur."¹⁹ It is reasonable to assume that the "forma" to which Ulpian refers is the standard rider commonly employed in imperial letters. When the rider was added to the imperial reply, the city was being instructed by the emperor to pay the ambassadors their expenses. But, if the rider were omitted, there would be no imperial order to bind the city concerned. Two cases in which Hadrian used both the formula and the rider involved problems of real substance: the difficulties of the Ephesian *gerousia* in recovering debts and the revenues of the newly-founded city of Stratonikaia-Hadrianopolis.²⁰ But the same embassy from this latter city which had raised these questions also brought two decrees which honoured the proconsul, Avidius Quietus, and the chief ambassador, Candidus Iulianus; the two imperial letters which acknowledge the receipt of these decrees give the names of the ambassadors but not the rider. This group of three letters shows clearly what the emperor's practice was: the reply which deals with the city's concrete requests contains the rider, to indicate that this was an appropriate function for an embassy, but the replies to the honorary decrees do not, to indicate that embassies for such formal purposes were unnecessary.²¹ Another example of this is Hadrian's reply to an embassy from Delphi which brought him greetings on his accession: although its text is damaged, there is no room for the rider after

προῖκα ὑπέσχηται, with variations in the form of the verb. In one letter of Caracalla a phrase has been added to the rider: κατὰ λόγον τ[— — — — —]. The latest editors suggest that it meant "in proportion to the time taken", the missing words having the sense of κατὰ λόγον τῶν ἡμερῶν or τοῦ χρόνου (J. & L. Robert, *La Carie* II, no. 149, pp. 274–276.).

¹⁷ McCrum and Woodhead, loc. cit., and Bourguet, loc. cit.

¹⁸ For a corresponding Latin formula without a rider, see note 15. Vespasian, in his reply to the Saborenses, does not name the envoys, but writes "legatos dimisi IIII ka. easdem" (ILS. 6092 = FIRA. I.² 274).

¹⁹ See note 4.

²⁰ Syll.³ 833; IGRR. IV. 1156, revised by Robert, *Hellenica* VI, pp. 81–82, II. 1–22. There is one other letter, addressed to Gytheion, which has the rider with the formula, but the text is damaged and the subject of the letter is not certain (IG. V. i. 1147, II. 1–6). One cannot tell whether the rider was added to a letter to Pergamon (IGRR. IV. 351, II. 18–21 = 350a, II. 2–6).

²¹ Robert, loc. cit., II. 23–38 and II. 39–54. It should be noted that the envoy named in the third letter, which refers to the decree in honour of Candidus, is not Candidus himself, but one Apollonius, son of Philip: no doubt it was thought fitting to send another envoy so that Candidus would not need to deliver a decree in his own honour. This shows that the rider was deliberately omitted from the second and third letters; it was not that its inclusion was thought unnecessary because the city had already been ordered to pay Candidus' expenses in the first letter.

the ambassador's name.²³ The replies addressed by Hadrian to embassies which had brought nothing but messages of greeting were cast in an entirely different form: a single sentence combined the ambassador's name with a reference to the content of the message, a form of reply which left no place for the rider.²³

The implication to be drawn from these documents is that Hadrian²⁴ distinguished between the embassies he approved of and those he disapproved of by including in his replies to the former the rider about the payment of expenses, and by omitting the rider from the replies to the latter, or by casting these replies in a different form. He must have hoped that this would reduce the number of unnecessary embassies: if cities took advantage of the absence of the "forma" from the emperor's reply to refuse to pay their ambassadors' expenses they would have difficulty in finding men willing to go on such embassies in future.²⁵ The drawback to this plan was the fact that the cities were unlikely to refuse payment to their ambassadors, since they were only too ready to spend civic funds on embassies. One would expect this "indirect deterrent" to fail, and Pius' imposition of direct restrictions suggests that fail it did.

In the early years of Pius' reign Hadrian's practice was maintained: the rider is omitted from the replies to embassies from two Lycian cities which had brought decrees in honour of Opramoas.²⁶ In one reply Pius was more liberal than Hadrian: the rider was added in a reply to an embassy which had brought greetings from Koroneia.²⁷ Thereafter the pattern changes. Only two letters contain both formula and rider, and both date from much later in the reign and are concerned with serious problems, a boundary dispute between Koroneia and Thisbe and problems of finance and jurisdiction in a Macedonian city.²⁸ On the

²³ Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 72, I. 11. A later reply from Hadrian to Delphi also appears to give the ambassadors' names without the rider; the text is damaged so that the subject of the letter is not clear (*ibid.*, pp. 82–83).

²³ ἐπιγυῖς ἐκ τε τῶν γραμμάτων/των καὶ διὰ τοῦ πρεσβεύον/τος Κλαυδίου Κύρου τὴν χα/ράν ἡγούμην/ σημεῖα ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν εἶναι (Syll.³ 831); καὶ πα]ρά τοῦ πρεσβευτοῦ ὑμῶν Π[ε]τρωνίου τοῦ Ἡράκω]ντος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ψηφίσματ[ος ὑμῶν/ἐμαθον] ὅπως ῥῆσθητε κ. τ. λ. (IGRR. IV. 1031c); cf. IGRR. IV. 1033, like the second, addressed to Astypalaia. This last embassy can have involved no great expense, since the ambassador had only a short voyage to the mainland of Asia, to Laodikeia on Lykos, from which the imperial reply was addressed.

²⁴ No attempt will be made here to distinguish the activity of the emperor in person from that of his secretaries.

²⁵ This of course would not affect those who performed missions at their own expense, but it was civic, not personal expenditure which the emperor wished to curb.

²⁶ TAM. II. 905, sections 37 and 38 (replies to Myra and to Tloas in 139 and 140).

²⁷ IG. VII. 2870 = Abbott and Johnson, *op. cit.*, no. 104, II. 6–11.

²⁸ *ibid.*, II. 11–20, written to Koroneia in 155; SEG. XIV. 479, revised by J. H. Oliver, *AJPh*. LXXIX (1958), pp. 52 ff., written to a Macedonian city in 158. There are no examples of the embassy formula from Pius' reign later than 145.

other hand thirteen letters from 145 A.D. onward contain the alternative formula, that the original message had been forwarded;²⁹ many of these are replies to formal messages of greeting or honorary decrees.³⁰

Therefore it can be concluded that at some date after 140 Pius imposed some restriction on embassies sent to him: only when there was some question of real importance to be raised were the cities allowed to send embassies, and all other messages of less importance were to be forwarded to the emperor by provincial governors. The conclusion that restrictions were imposed is supported by a document of 144, in which the decurions of Sala resolved to send a deputation to ask the governor's permission to send ambassadors to the emperor: cities could no longer send such embassies as and when they pleased.³¹ There are some documents which could be used to challenge this conclusion. In 153 five envoys travelled from Dacia to Rome on the occasion of the consulship of M. Sedatius Severianus, former legate of Dacia,³² and in 158 four envoys were sent from Uselis in Sardinia to invest M. Aristius Balbinus Atinianus as their patron;³³ but these embassies, which also exceeded the limit of three members laid down by Vespasian, were sent not to the emperor but to private individuals on unofficial business, and must have been regarded as falling within a different category. Nor can the extravagant flattery of the decurions of Tergeste be taken as evidence of the kind of embassies permitted under Pius: "oportuerat quidem, si fieri posset et si verecundia clarissimi viri permitteret, universos nos ire et gratias ei iuxta optimum principem agere."³⁴

Can the precise date at which Pius imposed these restrictions be established? The Sala decree provides a *terminus ante quem* of 144, and the replies to Tloas and Koroneia a probable *terminus post quem* of 140. The series of decrees of the

²⁹ TAM. II. 905, sections 42, 44 and 46–51, replies to decrees in honour of Opramoas from the *koinon* of Lycia or from individual cities; Syll.³ 849, a reply to Ephesos about its quarrels over precedence with Smyrna and Pergamon; Syll.³ 850, and IBM. III. 492–493, replies to Ephesos and to the *koinon* of Asia about honouring P. Vedius Antoninus; Syll.³ 851, a reply from Marcus as Caesar to a message of greeting on the birth of a child from a *synodos* of *mystae* at Smyrna in 147.

³⁰ One obvious exception is Syll.³ 849, but this kind of trivial dispute about formalities would not justify the expense of an embassy.

³¹ S. Gsell & J. Carcopino, *MEFR.* XLVIII (1931), pp. 1–39, commented on this document; the text of the decree is on pp. 15–17 = Ann. Ep. 1931. 38. The passage referred to runs thus: "deprecari(ue) prae/sidem indulgentissimum permittat praeterea per legatos apud sacratissi/mum principem celebrare" (II. 23–4 and 27–8).

³² ILS. 3896, a dedication from Mehadia in Dacia; for Severianus' legateship, see CIL. III. 1575, and for the date of his consulship, Degrassi, *I Fasti Consolari*, p. 43.

³³ ILS. 6107.

³⁴ ILS. 6680, col. ii, II. 17–20. In any case Tergeste was an Italian city and might have been exempt from restrictions imposed on provincials.

Lycian *koinon* in honour of Opramoas might be expected to provide a more precise date. However, there is no clear break in the series between the decrees which were sent to the emperor by embassy and those which were forwarded. In 138 an embassy was sent to the emperor with a decree in praise of Opramoas, following an appeal to the emperor by Xanthus against the refusal of the governor Seneca to ratify extraordinary honours for Opramoas; the emperor's decision in this case was relayed to the *koinon* by Seneca's successor.³⁵ In 140 the *koinon* voted to inform the emperor of the honours voted to Opramoas, but this decree was to be forwarded by the governor; the text of the emperor's reply is lost.³⁶ In 142 an ambassador was sent to the emperor with a decree in honour of Opramoas, and the emperor's reply, dated September 143, records the ambassador's name without the rider: Pius is still using Hadrian's method of dealing with "unnecessary embassies".³⁷ The next decree of the *koinon* was forwarded in 143, and so were all the later decrees sent to the emperor.³⁸ Were it not for the fact that the decree of 140 was forwarded, there would be a clear break in the series between the embassy of 142 and the decree forwarded in 143, and the imperial restrictions could be dated to 142–3; but this is not possible.

An imperial reply of 145 to the *koinon* of Lycia also uses the Hadrianic formula of the envoy's name without the rider, although it was written after the *terminus ante quem* of 144.³⁹ The sequence of events is revealed by a list of documents in the inscription; one Moles denounced the conduct of Jason, son of Nikostratos, as Lyciarch to an imperial official, Paetus,⁴⁰ and Paetus seems

³⁵ TAM. II. 905, section 26, the *koinon*'s decree, and section 28, Cornelius Proculus' letter. At this date there seems to have been no question of seeking the governor's permission to send an embassy.

³⁶ *ibid.*, section 32, II. 4–7 of col. IX. H: [συγγεγ]ράφ[θ]αι τὸδε τὸ ψήφισ[μα κα]ὶ διαπενφθῆ[ν]αι αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ [κρατ]ίτου ἡγεμ[ό]νου. The text of the emperor's reply probably followed that of the letter to Tloas on section 39 of the inscription, which is now missing.

³⁷ *ibid.*, section 53, the *koinon*'s decree; section 40, the emperor's reply. From the text of section 53, II. 6–9 of col. XIII. E, it appears that the *koinon* also asked the governor to write to the emperor about Opramoas. Possibly this was a request for a covering letter for the envoy, which might indicate that the restrictions had already been imposed, but the text is not explicit enough to make this certain.

³⁸ *ibid.*, section 55, with the reply in section 41; thereafter, 59 (145 A.D.), with 42, 63 (149), with 44, 66 (151), with 49, and 68 (152), with 51.

³⁹ IGRR. IV. 704. iiid.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, col. i. The post held by Paetus is a matter of dispute. He is called ἡγεμὼν, the equivalent of *legatus*, but the editors of IGRR hold that he must be the procurator, since Q. Voconius Saxa was legate from 142 to 147. Stein, in *RE*. s.v. Iunius Paetus, rightly held that only a praesidial, and not a financial, procurator could be given this title, and that in a Lycian context therefore Iunius Paetus must be a legate; Voconius Saxa's term of office accordingly should be limited to 144–147, and Paetus was his immediate predecessor.

to have referred the matter to the emperor;⁴¹ an extraordinary meeting of the *koinon* produced a defence of Jason and no doubt decided to send an envoy to Rome; the emperor dismissed Moles' charges and in a letter written in August or September 145 informed the *koinon*.⁴² No doubt the embassy was allowed by Paetus to go because he himself had referred the matter to the emperor, but the emperor thought that the embassy had not been needed, and showed as much by omitting the rider. These events show that, as one might expect, it took some time after the restrictions had been introduced for them to become completely effective: some embassies were still permitted to proceed to Rome, which the emperor then decided were unnecessary.

This raises the question of the form which the emperor's ruling took. The Sala decree shows that from 144 onwards provincial cities and councils had to obtain the governor's permission before sending an embassy to the emperor.⁴³ Pius presumably told the governors in their *mandata* what kind of embassies to permit. Did he also issue an edict to inform the cities and councils of the new restrictions? This would certainly have been desirable if they had not had to apply for such permission previously, but, if formal permission was already necessary, a change in the governors' *mandata* would have been sufficient: they could have been left to inform the provincials of the more severe criteria which were to be applied.⁴⁴ It is not certain whether the governor's permission had been required before Pius' reign, even if only as a formality; the evidence is very

In TAM. II. 905, pp. 349–350, followed by D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, p. 1599, Paetus' legateship is moved back to the years 125–126, because we know from the *Fasti Ostienses* that a Iunius Paetus was suffect consul in April 127 (see Degraffi, *I Fasti Consolari*, p. 37). This is surely impossible in view of the sequence of events revealed in IGRR. III. 704: the Iunius Paetus of this document received and answered letters from Moles and Alkimos about Jason; the actions of Moles produced a defence of Jason by the *koinon*, an embassy to the emperor, a reply from Pius, and a decree of thanks to the emperor from the *koinon* which mentions the accusation of Moles (col. iii. b., 1. 19). It is improbable that the list of documents places next to each other two accusations by Moles twenty years apart; they must refer to a single attack which took place in the 140s, since Pius' letter is firmly dated to 145. Paetus therefore held office early in the 140s, as Saxa's predecessor. It is interesting to note that a D. Iunius (–) was suffect consul in May 145 (ILS. 5038): Degraffi, *op. cit.*, p. 41, restored his name as D. Iunius Paetus(?).

⁴¹ See the reference to his reply to Moles, *ibid.*, col. i, 11. 15–16.

⁴² *Ibid.*, col. i, 1. 16, col. iii. d.

⁴³ See note 31.

⁴⁴ The evidence shows that no effective control had been exercised over embassies previously, so that, even if permission had been required, it must have been a formality. A general edict would have been desirable in order to drive home to the civic authorities that this was a new policy which the emperor was resolved to have enforced, and not merely the whim of the current governor.

scanty.⁴⁵ Cicero's letters from Cilicia show that under the late Republic a *lex Cornelia* limited the amount which a city might spend on embassies to Rome bringing votes of thanks to retiring governors, but they throw no light on the amount of control, if any, which the governors habitually exercised.⁴⁶ Under the early Empire restrictions were placed on such votes of thanks passed by the provincial councils, but the sources do not explain how these restrictions were to be enforced.⁴⁷ Two pieces of evidence from the East show governors exercising control but they refer to provinces from which it is dangerous to generalise. In Philo's *Flaccus* the Jews of Alexandria ask the Prefect of Egypt for permission to send an embassy to Gaius.⁴⁸ One cannot argue from this that all cities in all provinces had to ask the governors for such permission, since Alexandria was not a "full" city in the Greek sense, and the Jews formed a special community within Alexandria.⁴⁹ Nor was Egypt a province like any other province: the Romans maintained the strict control over departures from the country which the Ptolemies had exercised, and so the Jewish envoys had to have the Prefect's permission to leave Egypt at all.⁵⁰ Josephus says that the Jews in Jerusalem asked the procurator Festus for permission to send an embassy to Nero after a dispute with Festus and Agrippa II.⁵¹ Jerusalem was

⁴⁵ Von Premerstein, in RE, s.v. *legatus*, asserts that permission was required under the Principate, but the only evidence earlier than the fourth century which he adduces is Josephus, A.J. XX. 193–4; on this passage, see below. Cagnat, in Daremberg–Saglio, s.v. *legatio*, more cautiously decides that the case for permission being required remains "not proven" for the Principate. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung*, pp. 84–86, does not discuss the general question but only the restrictions placed upon votes of thanks to governors.

⁴⁶ Ad Fam. III. 10. 6 (see Tyrrell & Purser, *Correspondence of Cicero*, vol. III.², p. 333).

⁴⁷ Tacitus, Ann. XV. 20–22, cf. Dio Cassius LVI. 25. 6 (Augustus).

⁴⁸ Philo, *Flaccus* 97: ἀνέδομεν τὸ ψήφισμα αὐτῷ, δεηθέντες, ἐπειδὴ πρεσβείαν αἰτησαμένοις οὐκ ἂν ἐπέτρεψεν, ἵνα διαπέμψῃται δι' αὐτοῦ. See also *Legatio ad Gaium* 247: ἦν ἡτήσαντο πρεσβείαν, οὐκ ἐπιτρέπειν.

⁴⁹ See Jones, *The Greek City*, pp. 74–79, citing *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, pp. 316–329.

⁵⁰ Strabo. II. iii. 5: ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐξῆν ἄνευ προστάγματος ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας ἀνάγεσθαι τοσαύτη φρουρὰ κεκλεισμένου τοῦ λιμένος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐξόδων ὅσην καὶ νῦν ἔτι διαμένουσαν ἔγνωμεν καίτοι τὰ νῦν πολὺ ἀνεῖται, Ῥωμαίων ἔχόντων. See also P. Oxy. 1271 = Hunt & Edgar, *Select Papyri* II. 304; Gnomon Idiou Logou 64, 66 & 68 = ibid. 206; Smallwood, op. cit., p. 15, n. 5.

⁵¹ Josephus, A.J. XX. 193–4: ἐπὶ τούτοις ἡγανάκτησεν ὁ τε βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας, μάλιστα δὲ Φῆστος ὁ ἑπαρχος, καὶ προσέταξεν αὐτοῖς καθελεῖν. οἱ δὲ παρεκάλεσαν ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῖς δοῦναι πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ τούτου πρὸς Νέρωνα Two other incidents in the history of Judaea do not provide clear evidence either way. When the Jews in 4 B.C. obtained the permission of Varus, the legate of Syria, before sending an embassy to Augustus at Rome, Judaea was still a client kingdom under the rule of Archelaus, and not a province (Josephus, B.J. II. 80, and A.J. XVII. 300). During a dispute with Pontius Pilate, the Jews threatened to send an

not a “full” city any more than Alexandria, and Judaea, like Egypt, was a province in which Rome exercised “direct” and not “indirect” rule at this time.⁵² Thus the only two pieces of evidence for a governor being asked to give permission for an embassy come from the two most unusual provinces of the empire. It is noteworthy that Pliny discovered that annual embassies were being sent by Byzantium when he was inspecting the city’s accounts and that it was not a request for permission which prompted him to investigate.⁵³ One final piece of evidence dates from after Pius’ reign. Cassius Dio, in the speech placed into the mouth of Maecenas, says that the cities should not send embassies to the emperor but inform the governor of their wishes.⁵⁴ If this speech is rightly regarded as a programme of reforms,⁵⁵ it suggests that embassies were frequent under the Severi, but it is not clear from this passage whether the governor’s permission was formally necessary. Thus there is no evidence that in general cities had to obtain the governor’s consent before the reign of Pius, and the evidence of Pliny makes it likely that they did not. Therefore Pius probably did issue an edict to inform the cities that in future they must apply for such permission, besides instructing his governors to permit only those embassies which served a practical purpose. We have seen that at first some officials may have been less severe than the emperor wished, but the evidence from the last fifteen years of the reign shows that Pius succeeded in stopping all embassies except those which he himself felt able to approve.

Did Pius’ successors have the will or the ability to maintain this stern control? There is unfortunately very little evidence from the reigns of his immediate successors, so that nothing can be discovered of the attitude of Mar-

embassy to Tiberius, and Philo implies that Pilate could not have prevented them from doing so, but in fact it was a letter and not an embassy that was sent to the emperor in the end (Philo, *Legatio* 301–303).

⁵² See V. A. Tcherikover, *Israel Exploration Journal* XIV (1964), pp. 61–78, and Jones, *The Greek City*, pp. 79–82, citing *Cities*, pp. 273–278. Of course this is not to suggest that the people of Jerusalem did not run their own affairs under the supervision of the procurator.

⁵³ Pliny, *Epp.* X. 43: *requirenti mihi Byzantium rei publicae impendia indicatum est, domine, etc.* Another argument in support of the view that there can have been no general rule that all embassies must have the governor’s approval is advanced by Smallwood, *op. cit.*, p. 280: “the power of the provincials in general to initiate prosecutions for maladministration presupposes that they had the right to communicate with the senate or the Emperor without reference to their governors.”

⁵⁴ Dio Cassius LII. 30. 9–10: μήτε πρεσβείαν τινὰ πρὸς σέ, πλὴν εἰ πράγμα τι διαγνώσεως ἐχόμενον εἶη, πεμπέτωσαν, ἀλλὰ τῷ τε ἄρχοντί σφων δηλούτωσαν ὅσα βούλονται, καὶ δι’ ἐκείνου σοι τὰς ἀξιώσεις ὅσας ἀν’ δοκιμᾶσθι, προσφερέτωσαν. οὕτω γάρ οὐτ’ ἀναλώσουσί τι οὐτ’ αἰσχροῶς διαπράττονται, ἀλλ’ ἀκεραίους τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ἄνευ δαπάνης ἢ καὶ πραγματείας τινὸς λήψονται.

⁵⁵ See F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, pp. 107–109.

cus or of Commodus.⁵⁶ But there is sufficient epigraphic evidence to reveal what happened under Severus and Caracalla; thereafter there is a dearth of material for the period of crisis in the 3rd century. Six letters of Severus are certainly replies to messages from cities,⁵⁷ and in five cases out of the six we can tell whether the city's message had been forwarded or brought by an embassy: only one had been forwarded, and the other four were brought by embassies. Smyrna sent an embassy to raise a genuine problem about exemption from civic duties, but, since the inscription does not contain the full text of the imperial reply, one cannot tell whether the rider was added, and so the emperor's attitude is not revealed.⁵⁸ An embassy from Delphi asked the emperor to confirm its traditional privileges, and in the imperial reply the rider is added after the ambassador's name; Hadrian's reply to a similar embassy had omitted the rider.⁵⁹ Two of the letters are replies to formal messages of greeting. That from Nicopolis-ad-Istrum was, in accordance with the practice under Pius, forwarded by the legate of Moesia Inferior, C. Ovinius Tertullus.⁶⁰ The other message, from Aizanoi, is remarkable for three reasons.⁶¹ Although it was a purely formal message, it was brought by an embassy, contrary to the practice under Pius. Severus did not follow Hadrian's lead in such cases and added the rider which could be taken to indicate imperial approval. Finally, the embassy consisted of eight members (and an additional member had been released from the embassy), in violation of Vespasian's edict restricting embassies to three members.⁶² The

⁵⁶ A fragmentary letter from Marcus and Commodus to Pherae in Messenia contains traces of the standard rider, but the content of the letter cannot be reconstructed (IG. V. i. 1361). For other letters of Marcus and of Commodus which cannot be used here, see notes 7 and 9.

⁵⁷ A letter to Minoa in Amorgos of 208 (IGRR. IV. 1014) appears to be a reply to a message of greeting; there seems to have been no room for either of the standard formulae before the final greeting on the stone. A letter to Prymneseos of 195 (IGRR. IV. 672), also apparently in reply to greetings, contains a fragmentary reference to an embassy in l. 16. The other four letters are discussed below.

⁵⁸ Syll.³ 876. The line which gives the envoys' names comes after the final greeting, which concludes all imperial letters, on the stone. In the heading of the letter both the imperial titulature and the full title of the city government are abbreviated: οἱ θεῖοτάτοι αὐτοκράτορες Σεουήρος καὶ Ἀντωνεῖνος Καίσαρες Σμυρναίοις. This also suggests that the inscription does not contain a full transcript of the imperial letter.

⁵⁹ Bourguet, op. cit., p. 90; Hadrian's letter, *ibid.*, p. 72.

⁶⁰ Ann. Ep. 1926. 95.

⁶¹ IGRR. IV. 566. The exact date of the letter is a matter of dispute. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, pp. 673 and 1542, denies that it is necessary to emend the text so as to move the letter forward from Severus' third tribunician year to his fourth (i.e., roughly from 195 to 196).

⁶² For this edict, see note 4. Most of the evidence for the actual size of embassies between Vespasian's day and Severus' comes from the texts of the imperial replies. The evidence can be tabulated as follows. Vespasian: FIRA. I.² 72 – 2 ambassadors. Domitian: *ibid.*, 75–2.

explanation for Severus' welcome of such an embassy clearly lies in the political situation: Pescennius Niger had been disposed of, but his other rival, Clodius Albinus, had still to be dealt with, and, by making Caracalla Caesar, Severus had made a breach with Albinus inevitable. In these circumstances extravagant demonstrations of loyalty were to be welcomed, even though they violated established imperial policy on civic expenditure. However, the letter from Delphi indicates that later in the reign, when he was securely established in power, Severus continued to be far more lax than Pius in dealing with civic embassies, and his son seems to have shared the same attitude.

One letter has survived which was addressed by Caracalla to Ephesos during his father's lifetime in reply to a decree in which the Ephesians had expressed their loyalty and delight at a victory which had strengthened the empire. This letter also refers to an earlier request made by an embassy in the name of Ephesian Artemis, but it is not clearly stated that this decree had been brought by an embassy; the wording, however, strongly suggests this.⁶³ Three replies date from Caracalla's reign as sole emperor. Another letter to Ephesos grants that city a third neokorate, but there is no indication to show whether the city's request had been forwarded or brought by an embassy.⁶⁴ There is a fragmentary reference to an embassy in a letter to Pergamon whose content cannot be reconstructed.⁶⁵ A letter to Apollonia in Salbake ended with the ambassador's name and the standard rider; the subject of the letter again cannot be reconstructed.⁶⁶ Thus there is no direct evidence that the embassies which came in Caracalla's reign were concerned with unnecessary formalities,

Trajan: Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 70, II. 1-9-1 ambassador(?); *ibid.*, II. 10-19-1 ambassador. Hadrian: IGRR. IV. 1031-1; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 72-1; Syll.³ 831-1; *ibid.* 833-1; IGRR. IV. 1033-1; Robert, *Hellenica* VI, pp. 81-2-2. Pius: IGRR. IV. 704 *iiid*-1; IG. VII. 2870, II. 6-11-1; *ibid.*, II. 11-20-2; Oliver, *AJPh.* LXXIX, p. 52-2; TAM. II. 905. 26-2; *ibid.* 37-1; *ibid.* 38-1; *ibid.* 40-1. Severus: Syll.³ 876-2; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 90-1; IGRR. IV. 566-8 (+1). Caracalla: Robert, *La Carie*. II. 149-1. Civic dedications to individuals who went on embassies are numerous but of little value for our purposes, because they do not state whether the individual so honoured, often for several embassies, had any colleagues or not. A decree of thanks voted by Chersonesos to the mother-city, Herakleia Pontika, because Herakleia had sent an embassy to Pius in the interest of the daughter-city, does mention that this embassy had two members (IGRR. I. 861).

⁶³ Heberdey, *Forschungen in Ephesos*. II. 26; the editor dates the letter to 200-205 on the basis of the titulature. Line 16 suggests that this is a reply to an embassy: [ἀ δὲ π]ρο-επρέσβευεν ἡ πόλις ὑμῶν θεὸς Ἀρτεμις.

⁶⁴ This is the last of three letters on an inscription recently published by J. Keil and G. Maresch, *JOAI*. XLV (1960), Beiblatt, pp. 76-100, no. 7 (II. 15-22). The text has an abbreviated heading, like Syll.³ 876, and may therefore also be an abbreviated one.

⁶⁵ IGRR. IV. 365, fragments i-k, 1. 2: [διὰ πρ]εσβ[ευτῶν].

⁶⁶ J. & L. Robert, *La Carie*. II. 149 (pp. 274-276). Their comment is "le sujet même ne se laisse pas déterminer."

but the fact that all the surviving letters refer to embassies suggests that no very strict control was exercised over them. One other piece of evidence suggests that there were a large number of embassies without any real problems to lay before the emperor: an inscription records the journeys undertaken by an anonymous Ephesian to the courts of Severus and Caracalla, to Rome, to Britain, to upper Germany, to Sirmium, to Nicomedia, to Antioch, and to Mesopotamia, on behalf of his city.⁶⁷ The passage from Cassius Dio already quoted⁶⁸ also suggests that futile embassies were permitted under the Severi. Even if the cities still had to obtain the governor's permission in theory, the governors would be aware of the emperors' attitude towards embassies and would permit virtually any embassy; in this way Pius' system of control would become a formality. To enforce the restrictions an emperor was needed who had both the desire and the determination to do so.

The texts of the imperial letters allow us to see that Antoninus Pius established stricter controls over provincial embassies than his predecessors, and that he probably did so by means of direct orders embodied in an edict and in the *mandata* of his governors. Among his successors, the Severi clearly failed to enforce these controls properly and they may have consciously discarded them. In this one sphere at least Pius was readier than his predecessors to impose direct restrictions on the freedom of action of the cities, and more determined than his successors to have such restrictions enforced.

Both the need to impose and the later failure to maintain these direct restrictions illustrate the limitations on the emperors' ability to get their wishes carried out. It was not enough to formulate policies in the interests of efficiency, since such policies could be frustrated by interested parties among the emperors' subjects.⁶⁹ If the emperors' legislation was to be more than the expression of pious hopes, specific and strict regulations had to be issued, and constant attention by the emperors themselves was required to ensure that these were enforced. On this evidence Antoninus Pius appears to have been the most effective administrator among the emperors in the period examined.

University of Keele, Staffordshire

W. WILLIAMS

⁶⁷ J. Keil, *SBAW*. 1956, Heft. 3 = SEG. XVII. 505.

⁶⁸ See note 54.

⁶⁹ The classic case of a provincial community successfully disregarding the decisions of the Roman authorities over a long period of time is that of the Galillenses of Sardinia in their dispute with the Patulcenses (ILS. 5947 = FIRA. I.³ 59); see A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, pp. 19–20. Claudius, with typical frankness, openly admitted that his attempts to stop misuse of the *cursus publicus* had been frustrated by "nequitiae hominum" (ILS. 214). On the gap which existed between the aspirations of imperial legislation and its effectiveness, see also R. McMullen, *JRS*. XLIV (1964), pp. 49–53, especially 53.

Table I: Classification of imperial replies.

A: replies whose texts reveal that the original message had been forwarded.

B: replies whose texts reveal that the original message had been brought by an embassy.

C: replies whose texts give no indication either way.

	A	B	C	Totals.
Vespasian	—	2	—	2
Titus	—	—	1	1
Domitian	—	2	—	2
Trajan	—	3	—	3
Hadrian	—	12	3	15
Pius	13(+2)*	7(+1)*	2	25
Marcus	—	1	2	3
Severus	1	4	1	6
Caracalla	—	3	1	4
	<u>16</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>61</u>

* The figures in the brackets refer to those messages known from other documents than imperial replies from the tomb of Opramoas.

Table II: Classification of the references to embassies.

Column A: references in the standard formula, with or without the rider.

Column B: references in other formulaic language.

Column C: references in fragmentary passages or by implication.

	A	B	C	Totals.
Vespasian	1	1	—	2
Domitian	1	1	—	2
Trajan	2	—	1	3
Hadrian	8	3	1	12
Pius	7*	—	—	7
Marcus	1	—	—	1
Severus	3	—	1	4
Caracalla	1	—	2	3
	<u>24</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>34</u>

* This figure omits the "one" added in brackets to the entry for Pius in table 1, column B.



Continuity in a Roman Family; The Rufii Festi of Volsinii

Author(s): John Matthews

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Sep., 1967, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967), pp. 484-509

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435006>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

CONTINUITY IN A ROMAN FAMILY; THE RUFII FESTI OF VOLSINII.

In the house on the Mons Caelius which belonged to the family of the Valerii, there was found the base of a statue in honour of L. Valerius Poplicola Balbinus Maximus, consul in the middle of the third century.¹ We are familiar with the claims to descent from extreme antiquity which are implicit in this name; they were made even in the late Republic, as well as later – for Juvenal mentioned them in the early second century,² and this statue base attests them in the third. They are perhaps most notorious, however, in the case of the aristocrats of the late Empire, especially at the end of the fourth century. Such claims can rarely be substantiated in any detail, and they are usually viewed suspiciously by modern eyes. The father of the orator Symmachus, addressing L. Aradius Valerius Proculus Populonium, prefect of Rome in 337–8, praised his friend for his descent from the Republican Poplicolae;³ but by this time, the house where, in the third century, L. Valerius Poplicola Balbinus Maximus had been honoured by his clients, had passed by marriage to the Aradii – a new family of the Empire, who perhaps came from Africa.⁴

The sceptical approach undoubtedly brings us nearer the truth. But we should not fail to acknowledge the importance of the fact that the claims were made. A full study of the Roman aristocracy spanning the entire period of the Roman Empire would bring into prominence a continuity which might be less complete than the aristocrats themselves would have wished, but would still be impressive. Such a study would also reveal change, in the ways in which the families were in themselves rising and falling, politically and socially, and also in the differing reactions which they showed to changing historical trends and tastes which met them from outside. Their reaction to one of these changes – a change in religious belief, which they immediately treated as a change in

¹ G. Gatti, 'La casa celimontana dei Valerii e il monastero di S. Erasmo', *Bull. Com. di Roma*, xxx, 1902, 145. Cf. *CIL* vi 1531–2 = *ILS* 1190–1. He was consul perhaps in 233 and 256.

² *Juv. Sat.* viii.

³ *Symm. Epp.* (ed. O. Seeck, *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, auct. ant. VI, 1883) i 2. 4, to Valerius Proculus. Cf. A. Chastagnol, *Fastes (Les Fastes de la Préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire, 1962)*, No. 40, p. 96. The fourth century inscriptions of the Aradii from the house, *CIL* vi 1684–93.

⁴ Chastagnol, *Fastes*, p. 61 (*CIL* viii 14688–9 = *ILS* 3937–8).

taste – has received in recent years some careful and very skilful analysis: the Christianisation of the Roman aristocracy.⁵

It is clear that such a full study would need to be both a subtle and a substantial work, and also that the ambitions of the present article inevitably far exceed the material which it tries to assemble and exploit. But if we do not possess a full study, then the study of individual families can, as has been shown often enough, help us to pick out and emphasise what seems to be important in more general terms.⁶ The Rufii Festi are not a famous family; but they provide an example of a pattern of advancement and adjustment which must have been shared by many others. This article is an attempt to trace this family through, and to sketch in the background of the different phases of its existence.

I

Rufius Festus Avienus is, if not one of the less well-reputed, certainly one of the less frequently read⁷ of late Roman literary figures. It is perhaps a harsh test that we can still read several of his works; two long treatises on geography, the *Descriptio Terrae*, and the *Ora Maritima*, of which only one book seems to be left; his translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena* still survives, and there is also a short poem (*Anth. Lat.* i 876) addressed to one Flavianus Myrmeicus, which in a series of conceits requests from Flavianus a gift of apples from the orchards on his African estates. If we did not possess these poems, we should still be aware of Avienus' claims, from two inscriptions from Rome which succinctly set down and exemplify his entitlement to our respect. The first inscription is very brief: *CIL* vi 537: R. Fest. Avieni / his proconsulis / et celebris poetae / insignis memoria.

In the second, we have what is in fact a characteristic example of his style and interests, in the prospective epitaph which he composed for himself, and which was duly completed in time by his son Placidus. The local and rather obscure allusions in the first three lines recall many such discussions in his longer works:

⁵ A. Chastagnol, 'Le sénateur Volusien et la conversion d'une famille de l'aristocratie romaine au Bas-Empire', *REA* lviii, 1956, 241; P. R. L. Brown, 'Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman aristocracy', *JRS* li, 1961, 1.

⁶ On the general issue of continuity I would draw attention to a recent article, 'Munatius Plancus Paulinus', by John Morris, in *Bonner Jahrbücher*, clxv, 1965, 88; Dr. Morris does what I do not dare attempt, and presents a *stemma* extending over four centuries – including, by coincidence, the Rufii Festi of Volsinii.

⁷ To judge by the small number of editions; though isolated works have appeared since, the standard complete text is still that of A. Holder, Innsbruck, 1887.

CIL vi 537 = *ILS* 2944:

R. Festus v. c. de se ad deam Nortiam.

Festus, Musoni suboles, prolesque Avieni,
unde tui latices traxerunt, Caesia, nomen,
Nortia, te veneror, lari cretus Vulsiniensi,
Romam habitans, gemino proconsulis auctus honore,
carmina multa serens, vitam insons, integer aevum,
coniugio laetus Placidiae numeroque frequenti
natorum exultans, vivax sit spiritus ollis.
Cetera composita fatorum lege trahentur.

Sancto patri filius Placidus.

Ibis in optatas sedes; nam Iuppiter aethram
pandit, Feste, tibi, candidus ut venias.
Iamque venis, tendit dextras chorus inde deorum,
et toto tibi iam plauditur ecce polo.⁸

Placidus' addition, for all its brevity, is more evocative, personal, and expressive, than any of his father's work, once we recognise the delicate, but perfectly clear, allusion in it to the first lines of Avienus' translation of the *Phaenomena* of Aratus:

Carminis incentor mihi Iuppiter; auspice terras
linquo Iove et celsam reserat dux Iuppiter aethram.
Imus in astra Iovis monitu, Iovis omine caelum
et Iovis imperio mortalibus aethera pando.⁹

The translation, or realisation, of the *Phaenomena*, gives us some indication on external grounds as to the dating of Avienus; it is mentioned by Jerome, writing in about 387, as a recent version of Aratus.¹⁰ This need not imply any very precise dating. Jerome observes that many translations had been made, too many, he says, for him to be able to mention them all. But, in setting

⁸ P. Monceaux, 'Note sur un proconsul d'Afrique, le poète Aviénus', *Rev. Arch.* ser. 3, ix, 1887, 191; and see especially A. Garroni, 'L'iscrizione di Rufio Festo Avieno e l'autore del Breviarium Historiae Romanae', *Bull. Com. di Roma*, xlii, 1916, 123. Garroni has shown decisively that the author of the *Breviarium* was not the poet Avienus, but Festus of Tridentum, whose career is clear from *Amm. Marc.* xxix 2. 22 and *Lib. Or.* i 156: he was *consularis Syriae* (368? cf. *CTh* viii 4. 11 and Seeck, *Hermes* xli, 1906, 523-4): *magister memoriae* 370/1, and proconsul of Asia 371-2. In both the latter posts he succeeded the author of another *Breviarium*, Eutropius; cf. *AE* 1906, No. 30, and below, p. 494.

⁹ More prosaically, the allusions made by Placidus prove the identity of the proconsul with the translator of Aratus, doubted by Mommsen, *Hermes* xvi, 1881, 605.

¹⁰ *Comm. in Titum* i 12 (*PL* 26, 572); "quem Cicero in Latinum sermonem transtulit; et Germanicus Caesar et nuper Avienus et multi, quos enumerare perlongum est." Date, 385/7, F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre*, (1922) ii 156.

Avienus' version alongside those by Cicero and Germanicus Caesar, Jerome probably means to give it as an example from his own day – that is, the fourth century, as opposed to the Republic or early Empire. If it means anything, Cicero's and Germanicus' versions are mentioned by Lactantius, while Avienus' is not.¹¹ But even if we infer from this that Avienus had appeared since Lactantius' day, this gives broad limits for his dating that nobody would question.¹² These limits can probably be narrowed to give Avienus his place in the middle years of the fourth century.

Until we know who he is, the dedication of the minor poem to Flavianus Myrmeicus provides no assistance.¹³ Of the other works, the *Descriptio Terrae* is earlier than the *Ora Maritima*, which contains a reference to it (line 71). The *Ora Maritima* carries a dedication to Probus.¹⁴ The normal assumption, which can be accepted without serious qualms, is that Probus is Sextus Petronius Probus, many times praetorian prefect in the later fourth century, and consul in 371.¹⁵ If we accept this identification, then we can estimate the date of composition of the *Ora Maritima* in relation to the career of Probus, for in the introductory lines, Avienus alludes elaborately to his dedicatee's youth, and to his own standing, which, he says, might be that of a father to him.

Petronius Probus was born in about 330.¹⁶ After his quaestorship and praetorship, he held the proconsulship of Africa in 358.¹⁷ In 366 came the first of his prefectures, and from this time on, unlike most aristocrats, Petronius Probus was in office nearly as much as he was out of it – and even when out of office, he was often no less influential with the Emperors. He died about 390, when the Emperor Theodosius was in Milan with his Court after the defeat of Maximus in 388. There exists a letter of Symmachus to the *magister officiorum* Fl. Rufinus which alludes to a rebuke which had apparently been delivered by

¹¹ Lact. *Div. Inst.* v 5 (PL 6, 565).

¹² Accepted by F. Marx, s. Avienus, *PW* II 2386.

¹³ Identified with Nicomachus Flavianus, *vic. Africae* 376–7, by Monceaux, *art. cit.* 194, and Garroni, *art. cit.* 128. Certainly mistaken, though some trace survives in A. Momigliano, 'Pagan and Christian Historiography in the fourth century A.D.', in *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (henceforth referred to as *Conflict*), ed. Momigliano, 1963, 98: 'a friend of the Nicomachi Flaviani.' I can see no reason, either, why he should be identified with Flavianus, *proc. Africae* 358–61 (Pallu de Lessert, *Fastes des provinces africaines*, ii 62).

¹⁴ Lines 1–31; accepted as Petronius Probus by Seeck, *PW* I 2205 (Anicius 45), and Marx, *PW* II 2389.

¹⁵ Seeck, *Symm.* XC f., *PW* I 2205; on the prefectures, A. H. M. Jones, *JRS* liv, 1964, 85–7.

¹⁶ He died at just under 60, *CIL* vi 1756 a, line 9; on the date of his death, see below, p. 488.

¹⁷ *CTh* xi 36. 13.

Rufinus to Symmachus for failing to offer the Court his condolences on the death of a "civis emeriti."¹⁸ We do know that Probus must have died at about this time;¹⁹ the suggestion then that he was the distinguished citizen in question commends itself strongly. Symmachus, as consul in 391, would have to go to Court himself then,²⁰ and Theodosius left Italy for the East in summer, 391.²¹ The date of Symmachus' letter, and the death of Probus, may then fall between the summer of 389, when Symmachus first made Rufinus' acquaintance,²² and Symmachus' appointment to the consulship in late 390.

But in any case, in view of the early distinction of Probus, it is not likely that Avienus' dedication is later than 360. By 370, Probus was the most powerful man in the Empire, and Avienus' tone would be very incongruous then; and by the same token, one would doubt whether it was as late as the first prefecture of Probus, in 364, that the *Ora Maritima* was written. Probus was still a young man when he held the proconsulship, in 358, but I would be inclined to suggest that the dedication of Avienus was even before this, perhaps in the early 350's. The *Descriptio Terrae* was, as I have mentioned, an earlier work than the *Ora Maritima*.

Rufius Festus Avienus held two proconsulships. The place of one of these is fixed by an inscription which gives no date, but which commemorates the proconsulship of Achaia of Rufius Festus; the inscription comes from Athens.²³ In the *Descriptio Terrae*, there is an apparent personal reference which may quite possibly be recalling something Avienus had seen himself – sacrifices at Delphi:

Illic saepe deum conspeximus adridentem,
inter turicremas hic Phoebum vidimus aras.
(603-4)

This proconsulship, then, is secure. It would be unwise, however, to infer the place of the other simply from references in the poems themselves. Avienus was an avid armchair traveller; his guides, as he informs us on one occasion,

¹⁸ *Ep.* iii 88. On date, see below, note 22.

¹⁹ He had been dead for some time in 395; Claudian, *Pan. in Olybrium et Probinum*, 31 f.

²⁰ Seeck, *Symm.* LVIII.

²¹ Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste* (1919), 279.

²² H. A. Levy, *The Invective In Rufinum of Claudius Claudianus*, 1935, 27 f. to be preferred to W. Hartke, *Klio* xxxi, 1938, 430.

²³ *CIG* III i 635 = *IG*² II/III 3(i) 4222; E. Groag, *Die Reichsbeamten von Achaia in spätromischer Zeit*, 1946, 49; not identical, as Groag makes him, with Festus proconsul of Asia and author of the *Breviarium* of Festus. Barbieri, *Albo (L'Albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino)*, 1952, No. 1918, and on p. 518, makes the same assumption. See however note 8 and below, p. 489.

were the Muses, and on another he quotes an impressive reading list.²⁴ In another apparent personal reference, he talks of Tartessus, but it would not be safe to infer from the passage that Avienus had ever trodden the ground of that place:

Nos hoc locorum praeter Herculaneam
solemnitatem, vidimus miri nihil.

(*Ora Marit.* 273–4)²⁵

The interest in a cult centre is typical of him, but his knowledge in this case was perhaps acquired as it was usually, from the books. His other preoccupation with the place, again characteristic, is in the different forms of the name: Tartessus, Cotinussa, Gades or Gadir.²⁶ The post, moreover, which has been alleged for Avienus, that of ‘proconsul of Baetica’, never existed in the fourth century.²⁷

Many years ago, Monceaux, followed later by Garroni,²⁸ suggested that the second proconsulship was of Africa. The arguments they used, which were based on the personal experience Avienus seemed to possess of certain places, were not at all conclusive, but the intuition has now been justified by the discovery of an inscription at Bulla Regia, establishing the proconsulship of Africa without, unfortunately, providing a date for it.²⁹ Both Monceaux and Garroni were careful to distinguish Avienus from a proconsul of Africa in 366–7, addressed as Festus in the codes, and identified by Mommsen, the editor of the Theodosian Code, as Avienus.³⁰ The proconsul of 366–7 was, however, Julius Festus Hymetius, whose full name is known from epigraphic evidence, and who is described consistently by Ammianus Marcellinus, in his lengthy account of the proconsulship, as Hymetius.³¹

The new inscription, a short text of which only eight lines are complete, cannot be published here, but it is possible to give the main details of its con-

²⁴ Muses, *Descr. Terr.* 896; reading list, *Or. Mar.* 42 “Hecataeus istic quippe erit Milesius / Hellanicusque Lesbicus, Phileus quoque / Atheniensis, Caryandaus Scylax / Pausimachus inde, prisca quem genuit Samos, / quin et Damastus nobili natus Sige, / Rhodoque Bacoris ortus, Euctemon quoque / popularis urbis Atticae, Siculus Cleon / Herodotus ipse Thurius, tum qui decus / magnus loquendi est, Atticus Thucydides.”

²⁵ On cult of Hercules at Tartessus, cf. also *Descr. Terr.* 332f. ²⁶ *Descr. Terr.* 613f.

²⁷ Proposed by Marx, *PW* II 2388.

²⁸ Articles cited above, note 8.

²⁹ I am exceedingly grateful to Dr. Richard Duncan-Jones for showing me the text of this inscription.

³⁰ *CJ* iii 16. 1 (25 May 366), *CTh* ix 19. 3 (9 June 367); Mommsen, in *Hermes* xvi, 1881, 605, note 2; cf. the note on *CIL* xi 2997; followed by Pflaum, *Carrières (Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain, 1960)*, i 566, No. 215. Pflaum, again, identifies Avienus with the epitomator.

³¹ Amm. Marc. xxxviii 1. 17. Full name on *CIL* vi 1736 = *ILS* 1256 (cf. *ILS* 763, 768, Julius Festus); there are many other inscriptions to him.

tents. The full name – an important acquisition – of the proconsul is given as Postumius Rufius Festus (*qui et*) Avienius; the last of these names is placed in the manner of a *signum* at the head of the inscription in the genitive, 'Abienii'. We should perhaps accept the form in -ius despite the inconsistencies and hesitations of ancient orthography between forms in -us and -ius, as well as some worrying cases which can be found of the formation of false *signa* from ordinary *cognomina*.³²

The dates of the two proconsulships held by Avien(i)us are still not fixed. Monceaux and Garroni perhaps put them too late,³³ for, if the poet is recalling the days of his stay in Greece as proconsul, then the dedication to Probus of a subsequent work in about 350 would provide a date comfortably before this for one of the posts. For the present we must be content with this.

The identification of Postumius Rufius Festus with a senator called 'Abienus' who was put to death in the later years of the reign of Valentinian is an intriguing open possibility, and would be consistent with this dating.³⁴

II

When late Roman aristocrats looked for their ancestors, they found them in the times of the Republic. The Valerii Messalae, the Gracchi, the Valerii Poplicolae are only a few of the families who were claimed to be the ancestors of late Roman nobles.³⁵ It was in this same period, also, that these men tended to find their literary and historical models: we know well of their interest in Sallust, Livy, Cicero, and others.³⁶

Rufius Festus presents some interesting variations on this theme. The old Roman aristocrats were, as senators, only incidentally local figures. Rufius Festus tells his goddess Nortia how he lived at Rome, but was born at Volsinii. The goddess herself was a local figure; concerning her, we can consult, appropriately enough in this late Roman context, Livy, and the scholiasts on Juvenal. She was an obscure Etruscan goddess, identified in the world outside with

³² J. Guey, *REA* lii, 1950, 78–9; Guey published an inscription of Nicomachus Flavianus headed FLAVIANII, from Lepcis; also from Lepcis with such 'false' *signa*, cf. *AE* 1934, 173; *AE* 1948, 38; *IRT* 565, 571, etc. Cf. also *CIL* viii 25990 = *ILS* 6025, and *CIL* vi 512 = *ILS* 4154; *CIL* xi 4118.

³³ Monceaux suggested 355/62 for Africa; the late dating was influenced by the identification of Avienus' friend Flavianus Myrmeicus with Nicomachus Flavianus; cf. above, note 13.

³⁴ *Amm. Marc.* xxviii 1. 48. For the significance of this possibility, see below, p. 507.

³⁵ Jerome, *Ep.* 107. 5, etc.; note *SHA* Gord, 2. 2 (the Gracchi).

³⁶ Cf. recently H. Bloch, 'The pagan revival in the West at the end of the fourth century', in Momigliano, *Conflict*, p. 213; also J. A. MacGeachy, 'Q. Aurelius Symmachus and the senatorial aristocracy of the West', *Diss. Chicago*, 1942, Ch. VI.

Fortuna or Nemesis.³⁷ In this guise, she was a suitable patroness of the most famous of all Rufius Festus' compatriots, Sejanus.³⁸

Rufius Festus' distinguished ancestor was also, from some points of view, unfashionable. Musonius Rufus was certainly from Volsinii.³⁹ Tacitus calls him 'Tusci generis', and from Tacitus too we know that, far from being a senator, Musonius Rufus was merely an importunate equestrian.⁴⁰ Moreover, he was not a Republican figure, but an Imperial one – though of course it could be maintained that the reason for his recurrent difficulties with the Emperors was the freedom with which he expressed anti-Imperial views.⁴¹

The equestrian rank of Musonius Rufus was at least consistent with that of the procurator of the second century, to whom the descent of Rufius Festus can positively be traced. But it is hard not to feel that he was guilty of dramatising his ancestry, and perhaps of inventing the connections between Musonius Rufus and the less spectacular families whose inscriptions survive in Volsinii and its neighbourhood. From Volsinii itself, there is the equestrian career of C. Rufius Festus:

CIL xi 2698 (cf. Pflaum, *Carrières*, i p. 566, No. 215).

C. Rufio C. fil. / Pom. Festo / p.p. trib. cohort. V vi[g] / XIII urb. III
pr. proc. / provinciae Dalma / tiae et Histriae / C. Rufius Festus /
Laelius Firmus c.v. et / Rufia C. f. Procula c. f. / patri pientissimo /
l.d.d.d.

Also from Volsinii, there is a dedication to Ceres by Rufius C. [f. Fe]stus. (*CIL* xi 7272)

The first inscription is dated by Pflaum to the second century, because the tribe and filiations of the members of the family are mentioned; though on these grounds there is no reason why the date should not be in the late second century, or even the early third. That the children of Rufius Festus are recorded as of senatorial standing,⁴² we should reasonably put to the credit of their father's career.⁴³ Their social rise is confirmed by another inscription, from

³⁷ Liv. vii 3. 7; Schol. on Juv. x 74 (ed. Wessner, 1931): "fortunam vult intelligi poeta, quae apud Nortiam civitatem colitur, unde fuit Seianus." Other references include Tert. *Apol.* 24, *Ad Nat.* ii 8, Mart. Cap. i 88. For a dedication to Nortia at Volsinii, cf. *CIL* xi 2698 – and a decurion there was called C. Callius Nortinus, xi 2690.

³⁸ R. Syme, 'Sejanus on the Aventine', *Hermes* lxxxiv, 1956, 257.

³⁹ Suid. s. v. Μουσώνιος: Τυρρηνός, πόλεως Βουλσινίου.

⁴⁰ Tac. *Ann.* iv 59: *Hist.* iii 81.

⁴¹ See now A. C. van Geytenbeek, *Musonius Rufus and the Greek Diatribe*, 1963.

⁴² The senatorial children of the procurator, *PIR* R 114, 115, 120; Barbieri, *Albo* No. 2094, cf. 609.

⁴³ A. Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand*, 1927, 232–3; cf. Barbieri, *Albo* p. 535 (under "Gli adlecti nel senato; discendenti da cavalieri"). The point is not taken by Pflaum; "originaire d'une famille de la noblesse de Volsinii," referring to *CIL* xi 2997.

nearby Viterbo, where again a family of Rufii Festi of senatorial rank are commemorated:⁴⁴

CIL xi 2997: Fortune / sancte / pro salute / Rufiorum / Festi / et Marcellini /
et Proculi / ccc. vvv. / Antigonus / ser. a(c)t cums(uis?).

The names of Rufius Festus of Volsinii and his daughter Rufia Procula recur in the senators Rufius Festus and Rufius Proculus. All authorities acknowledge that there is enough here to show a close relationship between the groups from Volsinii and Viterbo, and with the fourth century poet Postumius Rufius Festus, who tells us he was from Volsinii. A little colour is lent by the dedication to Fortuna on the inscription from Viterbo, though this should hardly be pressed as evidence.

The same three Rufii from Viterbo made their way to Rome, where Rufius Festus and his sons, Rufius Marcellinus and Rufius Proculus, are preserved on a solid monument to their social climb, a drainpipe, whose precise provenance is regrettably not recorded:

CIL xv 7525 (Gatti, *Bull. Com. di Roma*, 1888, p. 180):

R]ufiorum Festi patris et Mar[
]ini et Proculi ccc. vvv.

The inscription is dated in the Corpus, consistently with what we know of the family, to the early third century.

It is at the end of the third century, or perhaps rather in the early years of the fourth, that another Rufius Festus⁴⁵ is found at Rome, in very impressive company:

CIL vi 2153 (Lateran):⁴⁶

Rufius Volusianus v. c. xv [s. f.
Rufius Festus v. c. xv s. f.
Sebasmius philos [opus
////////// pon [tifex maior
Brittius Praesens v. c. p. m.
Evagrius philosopus
Fl. Atticus v. c.

Rufius Volusianus is identified correctly with C. Caeionius Rufius Volusianus, prefect of Rome in 310–11 and again in 313–15, and ordinary consul in 311 and 314. His family was Italian.⁴⁷ Brittius Praesens was from a family which had

⁴⁴ Barbieri, *Albo* Nos. 840–2.

⁴⁵ Barbieri, *Albo* No. 1918.

⁴⁶ The precise purpose of the inscription is not clear; but Rufius Volusianus' son, Ceionius Rufius Albinus, is also described as *philosophus* (literary man?) on *CIL* vi 1708 = *ILS* 1222. The fourth name in the inscription in the text has been deleted deliberately.

⁴⁷ Chastagnol, *Fastes*, 52, No. 20.

been very prominent throughout the second century and for much of the third; it is possible that Brittius Praesens on this inscription was the grandson of the latest member of the family known otherwise, as consul in 246. This family too was Italian.⁴⁸ Fl. Atticus cannot be connected, unless he has links with a family of the later fourth century which owned property at Tibur.⁴⁹

With this, the family of the procurator had arrived. Its rise from the *primipilaris* of the second century to the senator of the third and fourth (and fifth) is impressive, but typical enough of the rise of many such families. The procuratorial career was a regular channel of access to the senate, and families from the Italian towns, not surprisingly, provide the largest, though progressively diminishing, single group of those who took advantage.⁵⁰

Yet there is something paradoxical in this consistent promotion of men whose claims were their services to the Emperors, to a body which was becoming, by a process of gradual and inevitable evolution, more and more distant from power. Against the lifetime spent in service by his ancestor Rufius Festus the procurator, Postumius Rufius Festus Avienus could show merely two proconsulships – and several books of poetry.

In taking this road, such men were rising on to a plateau of ease, *otium senatorium*; what Chastagnol has described most suggestively as “une oisiveté studieuse.”⁵¹ For senators of this class, political functions were reduced to a mere formal reflection of their earlier significance. Senators were rarely more than proconsuls, *consulares* or *correctores* of provinces in Italy and Africa, and, at the highest, prefects of Rome.⁵² These were all posts which they held for short periods, and even then they affected to regard them as unwelcome intrusions on their leisure.⁵³

III

In the later fourth century, political events opened the road once again to an honestly political life. Senators of the late fourth and fifth centuries acquired a position of enhanced importance which, in a now much smaller world, they were to maintain and fortify for themselves.

Under Valentinian, the Emperor and the senate had been alienated. His regime had brought a reign of terror for the senate – or at least some members

⁴⁸ *PIR*² B 161–70. This Brittius Praesens may have been *corrector Lucaniae et Brittiorum*, *CIL* x 468. Barbieri, *Albo*, refs. on p. 680. They were originally from Lucania.

⁴⁹ Symm. *Ep.* vii 31, *CIL* xiv 3517.

⁵⁰ Barbieri, *Albo*, 532 f. Pflaum, *Les procureurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, 1950, 170; table on 193.

⁵¹ Chastagnol, *Préfecture (La Préfecture Urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire, 1960)*, 453.

⁵² Chastagnol, *Préfecture*, 391, on the careers of senators; and see in general Part III, “Les Préfets”; also id., ‘Les Consulaires de Numidie’; *Mélanges J. Carcopino*, 1966, 215, 218 f.

⁵³ Cf. many letters of Symmachus. e.g. i 42, i 58, ii 17, 27, 32.

of it – in the later years, after 370.⁵⁴ The city of Rome was invaded by the close intimates and supporters of the Emperor, coming to conduct investigations and dispense penalties against senators. In the open tension which now existed, senators found themselves excluded from office, or exiled; some were executed. Senators were naturally prone to exaggerate the scope of this conflict, and to see in it, as Alföldi has seen in it, a conflict of classes and cultures. This is perhaps to give an unduly rigid and schematic impression; but it does appear from a systematic study of Valentinian's reign that senators were edged out by the Emperor's officials, not merely from Court office (for they were used to this), but also from the posts they expected to hold; the vicariate and prefecture of Rome, and the provinces of Italy and North Africa.⁵⁵

The iron regime of Valentinian was succeeded in the course of 376 by that of the supporters of Gratian, in the family and friends of the poet Ausonius.⁵⁶ The new order was much more friendly to senators, and indeed reversed the aspects of the policies of Valentinian which had displeased the senate. In this situation, the senate was brought closer to the Court, in a developing intimacy which we can read and reconstruct in the letters of Symmachus, from 376 till his death in 402. Symmachus knew nearly all the important officials of the reign of Gratian,⁵⁷ and he exploited these connections to support his own friends, several of whom went on to acquire high offices in this period and later.⁵⁸

One of these highly placed contacts was Eutropius, the historian and medical writer from Bordeaux.⁵⁹ Earlier, he had held the proconsulship of Asia, but he

⁵⁴ Different aspects of this conflict are presented by A. Alföldi, *A Conflict of Ideas in the late Roman Empire; the Clash between the Senate and Valentinian I*, 1952; E. A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, 1947, 101 f.; C. Schuurmans, 'Valentinien I et le sénat romain', *Antiq. Class.* xviii, 1949, 25; A. Chastagnol, *La Préfecture*, 430–2, with the notices in *Fastes*, 188 f., Nos. 72–6.

⁵⁵ Vicariate, evidence in Chastagnol, *Préfecture*, App. A, p. 464: Maximinus (370–1) Ursicinus (371) Simplicius (372–5). Perhaps we should add Doryphorianus, apparently *vicarius* in 375, Amm. Marc. xxviii 1. 53; *correcturae*, Maximinus, *cons.* Sardinia and Corsica 364–6, of Tuscia 366 (*CTh* ix 1. 8), see Amm. Marc. xxviii 1. 6: North Africa, Simplicius, *consularis Numidiae* 364/7, *CIL* viii 8324 = *ILS* 5535.

⁵⁶ Seeck, *Symm.* under Ausonius, LXXIX; Alföldi, *op. cit.* Ch. 4, esp. on 84 f. Chastagnol, *Préfecture*, 436–7.

⁵⁷ *Symm. Ep.* i 13–43, 62–107; iii 17–53 give a fair impression. I hope to publish a full analysis in due course.

⁵⁸ E.g. Potitus, *Ep.* i 19 (*vic. Rom.* 379–80); Fl. Gorgonius, *Ep.* i 39 (*CRP* 386); Palladius, *Ep.* i 15, 94, iii 50 (*CSL* 381, *Mag. Off.* 382–4, both in East).

⁵⁹ *Symm. Epp.* iii 46–53, cf. 50 "pars antiquior amicorum meorum." From Bordeaux, Marcellus, *De Medicamentis*, praef. (ed. Helmreich, Teubner, 1889, p. 1), cf. Suid. s.v. Εὐτρόπιος ('Ἰταλὸς σοφιστής). Seeck, *Symm.* CXXXII inferred an Eastern origin solely on the basis of his property in Asia (*Symm. Ep.* iii 53).

had gone into retirement when he was suspected of involvement in a plot against the Emperor Valens.⁶⁰ He then re-emerged under Gratian, to take his place with so many of his Aquitanian countrymen at the Court. At some time in this period, Eutropius met Symmachus at Rome,⁶¹ but soon, after the accession of Theodosius in early 379, he returned to the East with the new Emperor, and became prefect of Illyricum in the crucial years of campaigning 380 and 381, when the Emperor of the East was based for much of the time at Thessalonica.⁶²

Symmachus had written to Eutropius in 379 in support of one Postumianus, whom he describes as “iuvenem de summatibus.”⁶³ Postumianus, like his patron Eutropius, went to the Eastern Empire, and held offices there culminating in the prefecture of the East in 383; he is recorded in laws extending from April to December of that year. The prefecture is also commemorated on a bronze tablet from Rome, which gives the clue to who might be the relatives of Postumianus:

CIL vi 32035 = xv 7163: Postumiani v.c. / ex praef. praet. /
et Festi v.c. / trib. et notari / de praet. soteri /
n.n.

The identification of the prefect of 383 as a Westerner is quite secure, not only from the recommendation to Eutropius (and the general practice of Theodosius) but from a letter of Gregory of Nazianzus, who writes to a prefect Postumianus: precisely in 383, and refers to him as a Westerner who knew Greek.⁶⁴

Festus' post as *tribunus et notarius* fits the period well, and he should certainly be seen as a relative – probably a son or brother – for the function of the inscription, a label, clearly demonstrates that the two men on it shared property, however the last two lines should be understood.⁶⁵ But the name,

⁶⁰ Amm. Marc. xxix 1. 36, Lib. Or. i 159, cf. *AE* 1906, No. 30 (he was succeeded by Festus the epitomator, see. n. 8). Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 71 (*MPG* vol. 37, col. 135) also refers to this office; “ἡνίκα τὸν ὑψηλότατον εἶχεθ' ἑθρόνον ἔχοντα τὸ ἐπίφθονον ἔτι κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, εἴ γε μέμνησας.” M. Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz*, 1960, p. 80, denies, in my opinion mistakenly, the identity of the proconsul and historian Eutropius with the friend of Symmachus.

⁶¹ Symm. *Ep.* iii 50.

⁶² *PPo Illyrici*, Jones, *JRS* liv, 1964, 89; not *Orientis*, as Ensslin, *PW* XXII col 2500, and Seeck, *Symm.* CXXXIII. In view of his importance, Eutropius was probably the consul (Eastern) of 387.

⁶³ Symm. *Ep.* iii 48.

⁶⁴ *CTh.* ix 42. 10, xii 1. 98 (April 6); *CTh.* xvi 5. 12 (Dec. 3); cf. Jones, *art. cit.* 89. Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 173 alludes to other offices; Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie*, p. 148.

⁶⁵ See *CIL* ad. loc. One might understand either *notari de praetorio* (*tribuni praetoriani* are mentioned on *CIL* vi 1730 and 1761); or, separating the last two lines from what goes before, *de praetorio Soteriano* (or possibly *Soteri*) *nostrorum*, taking *praetorio* to refer to a villa or farmhouse. For such labels, cf., among many, *CIL* xv 7131, and the property of the Anicii on *CIL* 7154 ff., & esp. 7132; Probi et Probes nostris / de massa ce/lla binara.

Festus, being found in combination with that of Postumianus, may lead us back in the direction of the poet Postumius Rufius Festus. These names alone are perhaps insufficient, but the fifth century evidence adds further weight. This evidence is treated more fully below; for the present, the most telling item is the name of the consul of 448, Rufius Praetextatus Postumianus, who is usually taken for granted as a later relative of the prefect of 383.

A letter of Libanius of the year 392 is addressed to the nephew of the prefect of 383.⁶⁶ Libanius recalls that he had met the uncle in office several years before (presumably in Antioch); he mentions also that the nephew knew no Greek, and so had to employ an interpreter. The family was then evidently from the West. It is suggested moreover by Libanius that the family was descended from the gods – which is not so far from the claims made by Postumius Rufius Festus the poet.

It is possible that the Postumiani were in some way related with the great family of the Caecionii, for Libanius says that he himself was born in the year that his correspondent's grandfather was consul. Libanius was born in 314,⁶⁷ when the consuls were C. Caecionius Rufius Volusianus and Petronius Annianus. It is the first of these who is usually taken as Postumianus' grandfather, and this assumption may be right, though it should be observed that in the *Ora Maritima*, the poet Rufius Festus flirts with the notion that he is an elder relative of his dedicatee, Petronius Probus – whose grandfather was the other consul of 314, Petronius Annianus.⁶⁸

The ex-prefect Postumianus, after his return to the West, is probably identical with an ambassador of 395, who was sent by the senate to the Court at

⁶⁶ Lib. *Ep.* 1036 (ed. Foerster); on the identification, see Ensslin, *PW* XXII. 1, col. 890, and Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius*, 1906, p. 243. A different identification is proposed by Chastagnol, 'La famille de Caecinia Lolliana,' *Latomus* xx, 1961, 744; he makes the uncle of Libanius' correspondent a Postumianus who, in Symmachus, *Relatio* 30, had died by 367, leaving his estate to three women. Against this suggestion, apart from the *prima facie* claims of the prefect of 383, whom Chastagnol discounts, is the fact that Libanius' correspondent was supervising the education of a son of his uncle. This raises some difficulty if the father had died as long ago as 367 (the latest date permissible), for the son would then be at least 25 in 392; and Chastagnol also assumes that the Postumianus of Symmachus' *Relatio* had died without male issue (*art. cit.* p. 748).

I should like to acknowledge here with particular gratitude the advantage I have gained from a correspondence with Professor Chastagnol on this point (on which I have failed to convince him) as on the article in general. I am especially content to have his agreement that the prefect of 383, Postumianus, and his relative Festus, are to be linked with the Postumii Festi of the fifth century (see below, p. 513f.).

⁶⁷ P. Petit, *Libanius et la vie municipale d'Antioche*, 1956, 17; A. F. Norman, *Libanius' Autobiography* (ed. of *Or.* i with translation and notes), 1965, p. vii.

⁶⁸ *Or. Mar* 14–15; 26f.

Milan. Three senators were chosen, after much wrangling; Pinianus, Postumianus, and Paulinus. Valerius Pinianus and Anicius Paulinus had been prefects of Rome, in 385–7 and in 380 respectively. The members of the group are described by Symmachus as *viri inlustres*, and the third of them, Postumianus, could be well seen also as a *ex-prefect*.⁶⁹ The discrepancy between the rank of *inlustres* ascribed to him by Symmachus, and of *clarissimus* on his inscription (*CIL* vi 32035) should not, at this period, trouble us excessively. An *ex-prefect* of the Emperor Theodosius, who had held his post in Theodosius' own part of the Empire, would make a very suitable ambassador to Theodosius' son Honorius, and Stilicho, in 395.

A Postumianus is prominently placed in the opening chapters of the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius,⁷⁰ but it is not easy to feel certain as to his identity. He is made to decline the invitation from Praetextatus because of the pressure of his work in the law-courts of Rome, and to have to rely on the account of one who was there in order to relate the occasion to his questioner Decius (and to Macrobius' public). It is true that Macrobius gives no indication that Postumianus had any political importance – which, if the *Saturnalia* are placed dramatically in late 384,⁷¹ was recent. But neither does he mention that Symmachus was prefect of Rome and Vettius Agorius Praetextatus prefect of Italy, both in the same year, 384. There would be no force, then, in this argument. But it is still unlikely that Postumianus of the *Saturnalia* is to be identified with the prefect of 383, if only because the latter was a Christian. This is made quite clear by Gregory of Nazianzus, in the letter which he sent to the prefect in 383, asking him to support an imminent council of bishops, and alluding clearly to Postumianus' preparation and baptism.⁷² The measure of his piety may even be given in some of the laws which were addressed to him in 383; one is against apostates, two against heretics.⁷³

Though one might suppose that Macrobius was unaware of this also, it might still be better to make another identification, since it is readily available. The participant in the *Saturnalia* might be either the son or the nephew of Postumianus; they are known from the letter of Libanius to the nephew in 392. The son was in 392 perhaps rather young, for his education in Athens was being

⁶⁹ Symm. *Epp.* vi 22, 26, etc., with Seeck, *Symm.* LXVII: *viri inlustres*, *Ep.* iv 52. For Anicius Paulinus and Valerius Pinianus, Chastagnol, *Fastes*, Nos. 84 and 91, pp. 207 and 229. According to Ensslin, *PW* XXII, 1, col. 890, the prefect of 383 was dead by 395; if, as in my identification, he was still alive, then his son cannot be under the technical *tutela* of his nephew, Libanius' correspondent, in 392.

⁷⁰ Macr. *Sat.* i 2. 1–13.

⁷¹ Alan Cameron, 'The date and identity of Macrobius', *JRS* lvi, 1966, 25 f, is the latest treatment of this. The *terminus ante quem* is obviously the death of Praetextatus in late 384.

⁷² Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 173: "προεταλέσθης πρότερον τὴν εὐσέβειαν, εἴθ' ὑπεδέξω".

⁷³ *CTh.* xvi 7. 2 (apostates), xvi 5. 11, 12 (heretics).

supervised by Libanius' correspondent. Though Macrobius does include anachronisms, his Postumianus should not be one of them, for he is given a role which would only fit a man of mature years; as a practising lawyer who was invited to a serious discussion by Praetextatus. He was certainly envisaged as older than Decius, to whom he told the story of the occasion. The nephew himself is a better possibility. He was older than the son of the prefect by some years, and Libanius addressed him in terms which are openly pagan, by alluding to 'the gods 'who see all and do not fail to support men who are in distress' (meaning Libanius himself), and by mentioning the fame which comes to families who are descended from the gods.

IV

The *Saturnalia* is a work which has always, and for obvious reasons, seemed to be a central document of the paganism and pagan circles of the late fourth century. In two recent articles, Alan Cameron has argued strongly and convincingly against the traditional view of the date of composition of the *Saturnalia* and commentary of the *Somnium Scipionis*, and has placed the *floruit* of their author not in the late fourth century or the very early fifth, as has usually been held, but well inside the fifth, in the 430's.⁷⁴ Both the literary and the prosopographical arguments are very telling. The author, whose full name was Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius, is identified, after a suggestion of Mazzarino,⁷⁵ with Theodosius, praetorian prefect of Italy in 430. It was as Theodosius that Macrobius dedicated his *De differentiis et societatibus Graeci Latiniue verbi* to his friend Symmachus (on the assumption of the new dating, this would be Q. Fabius Memmius Symmachus), and, as Theodosius, too, he received the dedication of the *Fables* of Avianus.

Macrobius allowed himself some licence in assembling the *dramatis personae* of the *Saturnalia*; he included in his work a number of men who were in fact too young in the 380's to have taken part in the serious discussions of the learned participants.⁷⁶ These anachronisms include, demonstrably, the Vergilian commentator Servius, and Avienus; the latter is taken by Cameron to be the fabulist, Avianus, of the fifth century; the correct form of his name, as Cameron has shown, was Avienus. The poet and proconsul Rufius Festus Avien(i)us lived, according to the dating which I have supported, a full generation *earlier* than Symmachus, Nicomachus Flavianus, and the other leading Romans who took part in the *Saturnalia*; and it is consistent with this that,

⁷⁴ *Art. cit.* above, note 71, and 'Macrobius, Avienus, and Avianus', *Class. Quart.* forthcoming (1968 ?).

⁷⁵ S. Mazzarino, 'La politica religiosa di Stilicone', *Rend. del. Ist. Lombardo, Class. di Lettere*, lxxi (N. S. 3, vol. 2), 1938, 235, on 255 f.

⁷⁶ H. Georgii, 'Zur Bestimmung der Zeit des Servius', *Philologus* lxxi, 1912, 518.

far from belonging according to the common assumption as an intimate member to the circle of Symmachus, he is not mentioned once in the extensive correspondence of the orator – into which, incidentally, Servius only just creeps in a single letter, and Macrobius does not gain access at all.⁷⁷ The fabulist Avianus is not in Symmachus' letters either; as a member of the next generation after the 'last pagans', he provides an opportunity for Macrobius to pay a compliment to a friend and contemporary of his own, and to loose on the men gathered in earnest conversation a series of light anecdotes – the scherzo to the serious *Saturnalia*.⁷⁸

To some extent, then, the 'circle of Symmachus' was a creation of Macrobius; at any rate, he managed to draw into it more than one person who cannot be shown to belong to it. Macrobius himself, Servius, and the fabulist Avienus are notable examples, but Postumianus also has very few claims to be considered as a member of the group.

If the new dating is accepted, we shall have to concede that the *Saturnalia* tells us much less than we thought about the 'circle of Symmachus' round which so much of the intellectual and religious history of the late Empire has been written. The new milieu into which we must place the work may, however, be no less intriguing and important than the traditional one.

The whole occasion, as Macrobius reported it, was removed by several stages from the author. The account of the learned discussions was obtained from Postumianus by the young Decius (Caecina Decius Albinus, prefect of Rome 402) who had been, in 383/4, though not very young,⁷⁹ yet without the age and dignity of the generation of Symmachus, Praetextatus, and Flavianus – or his own father Publilius Caeionius Caecina Albinus, who had been there. The young Decius was, then, cast in the role of interlocutor of Postumianus. But even Postumianus had not been there himself. Since he had pleaded the pressure of his legal work as a excuse, he was forced to retail the story as he in turn had heard it from one who *had* been there, the obscure Eusebius. Now there is not much in the age of Symmachus and Praetextatus to connect Postumianus with their circles, but there are several fifth century members of the family whom Macrobius will have known. Does he perhaps include Postumianus, as he included Servius and Avienus, to compliment some later members of the family whom he knew, by including them in his recreated world of late Roman literary paganism? The role of Postumianus, as second-order narrator, is superfluous at

⁷⁷ Symm. *Ep.* viii 60. Nor is Postumianus anywhere addressed by Symmachus.

⁷⁸ On the methods and motives of Macrobius' selection of his participants, see Cameron, 'Macrobius', 33 f.

⁷⁹ He had been *consularis Numidia* between 383 and 391 – as had his father, 364/7; Chastagnol, *Fastes*, p. 257.

the same time as it is prominent to one who opens the *Saturnalia* at the beginning. Decius, too, had relatives in the fifth century who will have appreciated Macrobius' compliment.

The pagans whom Macrobius assembled for the *Saturnalia* would be strikingly projected into the author's own age if, as we might be led to infer from the names, the consul of 448, Rufius Praetextatus Postumianus, is a descendant of both Postumianus and Vettius Agorius Praetextatus of the *Saturnalia*. He would be a leading member of Macrobius' senate, and surely known to him. But the connections are at the least, elusive. If they exist at all, they must be by Rufius Praetextatus Postumianus' mother, Anastasia. His father was certainly Fl. Avitus Marinianus, praetorian prefect of Italy in 422, and consul in 423,⁸⁰ who could readily and plausibly be taken as a son or other close relative of the Gallaecian Marinianus, friend of Symmachus, and *vicarius* of Spain under Gratian, in 383.⁸¹ Fl. Avitus Marinianus' wife, Anastasia, cannot be connected on the evidence which we have. Though we do know that Praetextatus had at least one child, no names survive to us; and the names of his wife, Aconia Fabia Paulina, provide no opening.⁸²

This line of enquiry, then, leads nowhere; but there is a group of highly interesting inscriptions which reveal the members of the family of Marinianus and Anastasia, and also hold it together; a series of dedications from S. Peter's.⁸³ The first is by Marinianus and his wife:

Rossi *ICUR* ii p. 55, No. 10: (= Silvagni, *ICUR*, n.s. 4102):

Marinianus vir inl. ex pf. [praet.] et cons. ord.
cum Anastasia inl. fe[m. eius] debita vota
beatissimo Petro apostolo persolvit
qu[a]e precibus Papae Leonis
mei [pro]vocata sunt atq. perfecta.

A son of Anastasia, Gallus, is also commemorated:

Rossi ii p. 148, No. 15 (Silvagni, 4122):

Gallus Anastasiae natus decus addidit aulae
quod prosit meritis illius atque suis.
Munus ut grate sumat divina potestas
efficiet Petrus regia claustra tenens.

⁸⁰ Fl. Avitus Marinianus is commemorated by his son on *CIL* vi 1761 = *ILS* 1285.

⁸¹ Symm. *Epp.* iii 23–29; *CTh.* ix 1. 14.

⁸² Chastagnol, *Fastes*, p. 172. There are other possibilities, e.g. Praetextata the wife of Julius Festus Hymetius, Jerome, *Ep.* 107.

⁸³ This evidence has naturally been analysed before, e.g. by Duchesne, *Mél. d'Arch. et d'Hist.* vii, 1887, 387, and, with different conclusions from my own, by A. Silvagni, 'Intorno ad un gruppo di iscrizioni del IV e V secolo appartenenti alla Basilica Vaticana', *Bull. Com. di Roma*, lvii, 1929, 137.

Another dedication by Gallus from S. Peter's reveals his full name and rank:

Rossi ii p. 54, No. 7 (Silvagni 4125):

Rufius Viventius Gallus [v. c.] et inl. expf.
ur[b.] pro beneficiis domini apostoli votum solvit.

On a further inscription from S. Peter's, unfortunately fragmentary, a *clarissima femina* Anastasia is mentioned with Pope Damasus, either associated with him in a work of embellishment or, as I would believe, restoring work with which Damasus had earlier been connected. The rank of *clarissima* rather than *inlustris* may not be sufficient to make impossible the identification with the wife of Fl. Avitus Marinianus; at all events, the inscription is firmly ascribed like the others, to S. Peter's.⁸⁴

Silvagni, 4097:
]et Anastasia c. f. eius
]basilicae apostoli Petri
]item coelum
Da]masus vir sanctus in[
sumpt]u proprio marmoru[m]
decorarunt.⁸⁵

On the simplest hypothesis, Rufius Praetextatus Postumianus and Rufius Viventius Gallus would be brothers, sons of Fl. Avitus Marinianus and Anastasia. The names Anastasia, Postumianus, and Gallus, are again linked together on a gem which is now in Sicily. The precise relationships between the names are not clear:

CIL x 8061.4 (Panormus):

(i)	(ii)
Adeodatae	Postumiani
Anastasia	Galla viva
	tis

This seems to give added strength to the reconstruction which I have supposed. Earlier it was suggested that the Postumiani, with the names Rufius and Festus among their members, were linked with the poet Rufius Festus of Volsinii. This hypothesis would receive striking support if only a subscription

⁸⁴ There is no justification for the restoration of early editors, of the name of Fl. Macrobius Longinianus, *PUR* 401-2, as the husband of Anastasia, on the basis of Longinianus' baptistery in S. Anastasia (cf. Rossi ii, p. 150, no. 19 = Diehls, *ILCV* 92, and Chastagnol, *Fastes*, p. 256). For a Christian dedication by Rufius Praetextatus Postumianus as *PUR*, 443/8, see below, p. 519.

⁸⁵ Also in A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, 1942, p. 94, No. 4. 1.

to Aulus Gellius by one Gallus Avienus, v. c., were genuine. Unfortunately, the subscription seems to be a forged name on an invented manuscript, the brain-child of a notoriously dishonest scholar of the late sixteenth century.⁸⁶

It is clear, however, that the family of Rufius Festus Avienus did continue into the fifth century. We should consider for instance Rufius Placidus, consul 481, who recalls the names of Avienus' wife and son, Placida and Placidus. But still more evident is the consul of 472, Rufius Postumius Festus;⁸⁷ and since precisely a third of a century before him, in 439, there was a consul called Festus, it is natural to assume that the two were father and son, perhaps bearing identical names. The consul of 472 is known also from his seat in the Flavian Amphitheatre,⁸⁸ where his neighbours, whose names were inscribed with his own on the bench, were, one assumes, his relatives:

CIL vi 32202:

Rufii Postumii Fe[sti] v. c. et inl. [cons. or]dinarii

Rufii Valeri Messala[e v. c.] et inl.

Rufi Synesi Had[iria]ni v. c. [ex praefec]to urbi.⁸⁹

Rufius Postumius Festus' colleagues in the Amphitheatre lead us back to the age of Theodosius I and his sons,⁹⁰ for this was when they, like the prefect of 383, Postumianus, seem to have acquired political office for the first time. Valerius Messala, a friend of Symmachus, was, it is true, an ostensible member of an ancient Roman *gens*, but (even if his claims were genuine) it was one which had held no important office in the late Empire till Messala himself. He was praetorian prefect of Italy in 399–400. The Alexandrian Hadrianus, who was known to Claudian, was prefect of Italy immediately after Messala, from 401 till 405.

V

If the senate of the later fifth century can – and this is profoundly important – be largely reconstructed from the names of senators preserved in that most pagan of places, the Flavian Amphitheatre, we should not assess uncriti-

⁸⁶ O. Jahn, 'Über die Subscriptionen in den Handschriften römischer Classiker', *Berichte d. Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften*, iii, 1851, No. 25; 'A. Gellii P. Noctium Atticarum libr. xix qui supersunt cum argumentis Gallus Avienus v. c.'. Jahn's doubts are on the grounds that the 19 books of Gellius were not collected till later. See also Aulus Gellius, ed. Hertz, vol. ii, 1885, p. XVIII f. for a discussion of the forger.

⁸⁷ Also Rufius Aggerius Festus, v. c. et (inl.), *CIL* vi 32201. On Rufius Placidus, J. Sundwall, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Römertums*, 1919, p. 149.

⁸⁸ On the Amphitheatre seats, see now A. Chastagnol, *Le sénat romain sous le règne d'Odoacre*, 1966.

⁸⁹ The Rufii assumed related by Chastagnol, *Sénat*, p. 33, as by L. Cantarelli, *Bull. Com. di Roma*, xxvii, 1909, 275.

⁹⁰ Noted by Chastagnol, *Sénat*, 37.

cally this impressive continuity; the history should be represented, not as a straight line, but as a curve.

The horizons of the world of the fifth century were much narrower than they had been earlier.⁹¹ Most notably, the outlets to positions of prestige and power were now much fewer.⁹² The proconsulships were all lost to Roman senators, and, though the prefecture of Italy was now firmly in their grasp, this and the prefecture of Rome, with such other posts as they could hold from time to time, could not supply the same number of opportunities. But it was a result of the same process that in other respects the position of the great Roman families was enhanced. Though the number of posts was smaller, their monopoly of what there was was more complete. Sundwall's demonstration⁹³ that in the fifth century the prefecture of Gaul was dominated by the propertied families of Gaul remains fundamental; and the same development is true of Italy in the same period. The names of the Italian office holders are the familiar ones of the late Roman senate. Practical membership of the senatorial order, moreover, was increasingly confined to these men, as residence in Italy, and later in Rome, became necessary for senators. It is again significant, as Chastagnol has demonstrated, that the Flavian Amphitheatre provides at the same time both the record of senators and of residents in Rome.⁹⁴ Perhaps most telling of all, these families retained their economic dominance of the resources of land and manpower in Italy, which the Emperor could not possibly risk losing.⁹⁵ So the Roman senate was 'managed', as much by the Gothic kings as it had been by the Roman Emperors.

The Postumii Rufii Festi and their relatives had become, as should by now be clear, members of this group of powerful families, profiting from the 'boom' period for their class, and providing consuls and prefects in impressive numbers in the later fourth and in the fifth centuries. And as the senate emerges in the fifth century in a new but related function as a 'corps diplomatique', the members of the family are at once prominent.

In 452, for instance, an embassy was sent from Rome to the north of Italy, to try to persuade the Hun Attila not to attack Rome.⁹⁶ The mission was successful, and Attila withdrew from Italy, perhaps for good strategic reasons rather than from especial admiration of the members of the strikingly assorted group.

⁹¹ Cf. the evocative comments of H. I. Marrou, *Rev. du Moyen Age Latin*, i, 1945, 200 (review of A. Loyer, *Sidoine Apollinaire et l'esprit précieux en Gaule aux derniers jours de l'Empire*, 1943.)

⁹² Chastagnol, *Sénat*, 46, with Appendix IV, p. 96-9.

⁹³ J. Sundwall, *Weströmsche Studien*, 1915.

⁹⁴ Chastagnol, *Sénat*, 46, *Préfecture*, 127-8.

⁹⁵ Sundwall, *Westr. Stud.*, 150; also L. Ruggini, *Economia e Società nell'Italia Annonaria*, 1961, 54 and 403.

⁹⁶ *Prosp. Chron. s. a. (Chron. Min. i p. 482).*

It consisted of the senators Trygetius and Gennadius Avienus, and the Pope, Leo the Great. Trygetius is a likely descendant of the father of a praetorian candidate of 376, when Symmachus delivered a speech in the senate, asking for the fixing of the young man's praetorian games for ten years ahead.⁹⁷ There is a reasonable possibility that the candidate himself was the Trygetius whom Augustine knew at Cassiciacum about ten years later.⁹⁸ It is not clear when we enter the next generation; either with Trygetius, *comes rei privatae* in 423,⁹⁹ or with an ambassador who in 435 signed an agreement with the Vandal Geiseric, giving him a standing in North Africa;¹⁰⁰ certainly with the ambassador of 452, who is described then as *vir praefectorius*. Finally, a Memmius Aemilius Trygetius is discovered with a relative Memmius Aemilius Probus in the Flavian Amphitheatre.¹⁰¹

Trygetius' colleague in 452, Gennadius Avienus, similarly stands between better attested generations. He was the grandfather of the consul of 501, Rufius Magnus Faustus Avienus, whose cousin, Fl. Avienus,¹⁰² was consul in the following year. Gennadius Avienus was one of two senators whose patronage was sought by Sidonius Apollinaris on his Gallic embassy to Rome in 467.¹⁰³ According to Sidonius, he was the less desirable patron. He was the older of the two; he had acquired the consulship by luck rather than by merit, and he never ceased to foster and protect his own relatives. The other senator, Fl. Caecina Decius Maximus Basilius, consul in 463, extended his support to all without preference of kinship, and of course to Sidonius (who had prudently courted them both). To betray Sidonius' preferences, which were no doubt transferable, his patron's son, also called Caecina Decius Maximus Basilius, married a daughter of Gennadius Avienus, and was the father of the consul of 502, Fl. Avienus.¹⁰⁴

These 'Romans of Rome' possessed what are almost colonist outposts at Constantinople, where Western aristocrats had settled; for this very reason, Constantinople became a prominent centre for Latin studies in the later fifth

⁹⁷ Symm. *Or.* V; Seeck, *Symm.* p. V.

⁹⁸ Augustine, *C. Acad.* i 4, *De Ord.* i 5, *De Beata Vita* i 6; (ed. CSEL, vol. LXIII).

⁹⁹ *CTh* xi 20. 4 (May 19, 423).

¹⁰⁰ Prosp. *Chron.* s.a. (*Chron. Min.* i p. 474) Sundwall, *Westr. Stud.* p. 140, No. 474, identifies the CRP of 423, the ambassador of 435, and that of 452. This could be correct, but not easily if the praetorian candidate of the 380's is the same as the CRP; then we should have to assume a further generation.

¹⁰¹ *CIL* vi 32187: Chastagnol, *Sénat* 33. following Ch. Huelsen, *Hermes*, xxxviii, 1903, 155.

¹⁰² Sundwall, *Abhandlungen*, 164 (cf. 150).

¹⁰³ Sid. *Apoll. Ep.* i 9; C. E. Stevens, *Sidonius Apollinaris and his age*, 1933, 96.

¹⁰⁴ If Sundwall is right, *Abhandlungen*, 95-7 (stemma on 130).

century.¹⁰⁵ Later, in the sixth, it was the members of these emigre groups who were important in giving the encouragement for the reconquest of the West attempted by Justinian; but earlier, and notably between 515 and 520, the connections had been exploited by diplomats from the West, travelling in the cause of church unity. Rufius Festus himself, consul in 472, went on more than one such mission.¹⁰⁶

But such contacts are indicative mainly of the great distance which now separated Rome and Constantinople – it was a distance which could only be closed by conquest – and the issue of church unity is an ominous one. In these relations with the Eastern capital, and even at times with the Court at Ravenna, we are in the history of diplomacy; relations with foreign powers. Similarly with the embassy of Sidonius in 467; he came from a friendly, but almost a foreign, country.

VI

Another inevitable development in this curved history was the enhanced position of the Popes, and the process by which the senators begin to present a closed front with them. The embassy of Trygetius, Avienus, and Leo in 452 is a notable example in a political context. The interplay has many aspects, and the inquiries can take us far into the future; the description of Severinus, who became Pope in 640, as ‘natione Romanus, ex patre Abieno’¹⁰⁷ should be an encouragement not to give up hope of finding ‘senators’ much later than they are usually sought, and in unexpected places.

We have already seen some of the evidence of this rapprochement in the numerous dedications made by the family of Fl. Avitus Marinius and Anastasia in S. Peter’s; they include the restoration, in all likelihood, of the Damasan baptistery. One wonders whether it is merely coincidental that some of this, and the other, evidence, can be ascribed to the time of Leo,¹⁰⁸ the first Pope to be buried in S. Peter’s.¹⁰⁹ It is to his time, too, that we can date the inscription commemorating the foundation by Pammachius, the famous aristocratic ascetic of the late fourth and early fifth centuries, of the famous church on the Clivus Scauri at Rome, many years after Pammachius’ own death.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ A. Momigliano, ‘Gli Anicii e la storiografia latina del VI sec. D.C.’ (*Rend. Acad. Linc., Cl. di scienze morali, storiche, e filologiche*, ser. viii, vol. xi, 11–12, 1956, p. 279 = *Secondo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici*, 1960, 231, esp. on 240); see also id., ‘Cassiodorus and Italian Culture of his Time’ (*Proc. Brit. Acad.* xli, 1955, 207 = *Sec. Contr.* 191 f; esp. on 199). ¹⁰⁶ Sundwall, *Abhandlungen*, 121. ¹⁰⁷ *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i p. 328.

¹⁰⁸ P. R. L. Brown, *JRS* li, 1961, 10. ¹⁰⁹ *Lib. Pont.* i p. 239.

¹¹⁰ Rossi ii p. 150 No. 20. F. Lanzoni, *Riv. di Arch. Crist.* ii, 1925, 208–10; A. Prandi, *Il complesso monumentale della basilica dei SS. Giovanni e Paolo*, 1955, 475 f. On this and other activity see R. Vielliard, *Recherches sur les origines de Rome chrétienne*, 1959, 71–105.

But, whether or not Leo played an especially prominent part in this development, it cannot be confined to this time. The dedication and embellishment of churches by senators had begun earlier, and it continued afterwards, through the fifth and early sixth centuries.¹¹¹ (Rufius Praetextatus Postumianus, as prefect of Rome between 443 and 448, restored the church of S. Paul on the road to Ostia, which had earlier been rebuilt by Damasus.¹¹²)

So the senate moved closer to the church. On the other side, one of the most important consequences of this closing of the ranks was that the Popes would find themselves patronising the old culture and ensuring its continuity in Christian Rome. For in this Christianised society, the pagan tradition continued, though in a significantly modified form.

In the later part of the fifth century, we suddenly catch another glimpse of the *epigono*i of the *Saturnalia*, in the subscription to a manuscript of Macrobius' commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis* of Cicero.¹¹³ It was revised at Ravenna by Q. Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, in appropriate company, if the colleague who shared the work, Macrobius Plotinus Eudoxius, was the grandson of the author of the *Saturnalia*.¹¹⁴ This member of the Symmachi was consul in 485; he was the son of the consul of 446, Q. Aurelius Symmachus, grandson of Q. Fabius Memmius Symmachus, and great-grandson of the famous orator. It was said of the consul of 485, Q. Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, by his contemporary Cassiodorus, that he was –

“patricius et consul ordinarius vir philosophus, qui antiqui Catonis fuit novellus imitator, sed virtutes veterum sanctissima religione transcendit. Dixit sententiam pro allecticiis in senatu parentesque suos imitatus historiam quoque Romanam septem libris edidit.”¹¹⁵

So Cassiodorus and Symmachus take us back into the fourth century. We still possess fragments of speeches of the great orator Symmachus, “pro

¹¹¹ E.g. the property *Sextilianum*, of Memmius Aemilius Trygetius, Sundwall, *Abhandlungen*, 164, Ensslin, *PW* s. Trygetius (4); perhaps most famous, the donations of Fl. Theodobius (*qui et*) Valila at Tibur (*Lib. Pont.* i 249) and at Rome, the so-called ‘Basilica of Junius Bassus’, cf. Ch. Huelsen, *Nuov. Bull. di Arch. Crist.* v 1899, 171, G. Lugli, *Riv. di Arch. Crist.* ix, 1932, 221; see Viellard, *op. cit.*

¹¹² See now Chastagnol, ‘Sur quelques documents relatifs à la basilique de Saint-Paul-hors-les-Murs’, *Mélanges A. Piganiol*, 1966, vol. i, p. 421, on 435 (and *Préfecture*, 354).

¹¹³ “Aurelius Memmius v. c. emendabam vel distinguebam meum Ravennae cum Macrobio Plotino Eudoxio v. c.” After his consulship in 485, Q. Aurelius Memmius Symmachus would be v. c. *et inl.* O. Jahn *art. cit.* (note 86 above), No. 11.

¹¹⁴ Cameron, ‘Macrobius’ p. 37.

¹¹⁵ *Ordo generis Cassiodororum*, in *MGH auct. ant.* XII (Cassiodorus, ed. Mommsen), p. V.

allecticiis,"¹¹⁶ and the history mentioned by Cassiodorus will be that which was commissioned by Theodosius from Nicomachus Flavianus.¹¹⁷

It is a truism to talk in terms of an 'idealisation of the past' when we look at this survival and constant recreation of the last group of pagan Romans. It had begun with Macrobius, who, as we saw, contrived to draw into the 'circle of Symmachus' more than one person who cannot be shown to have in fact belonged to it. It is Macrobius, too, who emphasises the *literary* aspects of late Roman paganism; was this, too, his own creation?

This cannot be entirely the case, for there was clearly a lot of learning in the paganism of the late fourth century, and Praetextatus is described on his long epitaph as "multiplex doctus."¹¹⁸ But the late pagans are also known in a more dynamic and specifically religious context, in the inscriptions which survive recording their priesthoods and initiations – especially the group from the *Phrygianum* at Rome.¹¹⁹ And it should never be forgotten that Symmachus himself does not stand with Praetextatus in his paganism, for he is right outside the 'Orientalising' tradition represented by Praetextatus and many other pagans.¹²⁰

If Macrobius did write in the 430's, then he shows the shift from the *Phrygianum* to the books at an early stage, not only in the tone which dominates the *Saturnalia*, but even in its setting in Praetextatus' library. The notion that the *Saturnalia* is a work of pagan propaganda has not always seemed convincing. Now we have a further aspect in the assessment of the work – as a stage in the refinement of late Roman paganism into a literary paganism which is quite consistent with the Christianity – even with a pious Christianity – which accompanied it. The recension of the *Somnium Scipionis* made at Ravenna must surely have been the work of Christians.

The context of this shift of a religious into a more purely literary interest is elusive, but quite intelligible; the official Christianisation of the Roman aristocracy. The family of the 'last pagan', Nicomachus Flavianus, had been forcibly converted by Theodosius, after the defeat of Eugenius; but, when

¹¹⁶ Symm. Or. VI, VII.

¹¹⁷ CIL vi 1783 = ILS 2948 mentions the history; the inscription, rehabilitating the memory of Flavianus, was dedicated by his nephew Appius Nicomachus Dexter, the editor of Livy.

¹¹⁸ CIL 1779 = ILS 1259, line 15; see H. Bloch, 'A New Document of the last Pagan revival in the West', *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxxviii, 1945, 199, on 205 and in *Conflict*, ed. Momigliano, 207, for Praetextatus' learning.

¹¹⁹ CIL vi 497–504 (not the fashionable pagans); the epigraphic evidence is tabulated by Bloch, *HTR* 1945, after p. 245; see also Bloch, in *Conflict*, 202f.

¹²⁰ D. N. Robinson, 'Symmachus and the Pagan Revival' *Tr. Am. Phil. Ass.* xlv, 1915, 87; MacGeachy, *Symmachus*, 1942, Ch. V.

Macrobius was about to write, Flavianus' memory was restored in a speech by the Emperor which selected for mention his historical writing. The problems are emphasised, and to a degree dissolved at the same time, by a relative of the Avieni in the early sixth century; Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius, consul in 527. He was apparently the son of Decius Caecina Mavortius Basilius, consul 486 – and hence a cousin of the two Avieni, consuls 501 and 502.¹²¹

Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius was the associate of a learned and cultured Pope, Agapitus, whose library, which he founded at Rome with the encouragement and assistance of Cassiodorus himself, for the preservation of the Classics, has been located at Rome by the discovery of the inscription which later stood over the door; on the Clivus Scauri (across the road from Pammachius' church), near the Porta Capena.¹²² It was here – at the Porta Capena – in the year of the last consul of the Western Empire, that the last known *rhetor* of the city of Rome worked, "Christo adiuvante," on the bad texts of Martianus Capella.¹²³ The *rhetor* was called Securus Melior Felix, and it was he who assisted Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius in the editing of one of the two texts for whose care he is famous, the *Epodes* of Horace.¹²⁴ The other writer edited by Mavortius was, of course, the Christian lyric poet of the Theodosian age, Prudentius.¹²⁵

We should like to be able to infer from the names of Mavortius and his father that the pagan families of the late fourth century continued to be linked together in the Christian fifth century by marriages which held the old groups to each other in their new environment. The aspect of this shift which I have tried to sketch is in the progress of the ideals of late paganism into a literary

¹²¹ Sundwall, *Abhandlungen*, III, 139, stemma, p. 130; also, Ensslin, *PW* XIV 2343 Mavortius 3 & 4.

¹²² H. I. Marrou, 'Autour de la bibliothèque du Pape Agapit', *Mél. d'Arch. et d'Hist.* xlviii, 1931, 124–169. The inscription reads BIBLIOTHECA AGAPETI I / A DXXXV–DXXXVI; cf. also the elegiacs in the *Sylloge Einsidlensis*, lines 3–4, "Hos inter residens Agapetus iure sacerdos / codicibus pulchrum condidit arte locum" (Rossi ii p. 28, *Lib. Pont.* i 288).

¹²³ Mart. Cap., end of Book I; "Securus Melior Felix v. sp. com. consist. rhetor urbis R. ex mendosissimis exemplaribus emendabam contra legente Deuterio scholastico discipulo meo Romae ad portam Capenam cos. Paulini v. c. [534] sub d. Non. Martiarum Christo adiuvante".

¹²⁴ Hor. *Epodes*; "Vettius Agorius Basileus Mavoritus v. c. et inl. ex. com. dom. ex cons. ord. [527] legi ut potui emendavi conferente mihi magistro Felice oratore urbis Romae."

¹²⁵ Paris, Bibl. Nat. *Lat.* 8084, fol. 45; "Vettius Agorius Basilius", cf. Mommsen, *Hermes* iv, 1870, 350. The assumption of Mazzarino, *art. cit.* (note 75 above), on 259, that Vettius Agorius Basilius [Mavortius] edited the so-called *Carmen Adversus Flavianum*, which is preserved elsewhere in the same manuscript, seems to be based on a misreading of Mommsen's article. For an account of the manuscript, cf. E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, vol 5, No. 571 a and b.

tradition, of which Macrobius, with his new date, is a part, and Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius at least the symbolic climax. This development is itself an aspect, however paradoxical, of Christianisation. We are perhaps missing the point when we try to count the chances of Macrobius and his friends being Christians or pagans.¹²⁶ At their time, they would naturally have been Christians, and regarded themselves as such. That they should be so is not remarkable, but rather an integral part of their position and interests in a Christianised society.

Balliol College, Oxford.

JOHN MATTHEWS

¹²⁶ Cameron has pointed to the fact that Macrobius knows of the story of the slaughter of the Innocents (which he mentions in order to quote a witticism of Augustus!); *Macr. Sat.* ii 4. 11.

I would like to thank most sincerely Mr. P. R. L. Brown, Mr. Alan Cameron, Professor A. Chastagnol, and Professor R. Syme for reading this article and offering many criticisms and comments.

MISZELLE

PHILIP II AND THE HYPASPISTS

The hypaspists of Alexander the Great¹ have long been a fertile field for disputing scholars. The main area of controversy has been the question of the arms and armour of the troops: Berve² believed that they were more lightly armed than the phalangites (who themselves, in his account, were armed similarly to the Greek hoplite³); Kromayer-Veith⁴ make the hypaspists like peltasts, armed with shield and short spear; Parke⁵ calls them "a light-armed, spear-throwing force, . . . used with the phalanx just as professional peltasts were elsewhere combined with citizen hoplites." Tarn, however, successfully refuted these views,⁶ showing that the difference between the phalanx and the hypaspists was one

¹ In this article I am only concerned with the hypaspists who appear during the 4th century and not with later developments of the corps under the Diadochi. For a useful discussion of the later hypaspists (especially those of Philip V) see Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon*, App. II. p. 290ff.

² H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (1926), vol. I. 125, henceforth cited as Berve I.

³ Berve I 113.

⁴ J. Kromayer and G. Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer* (1928), henceforth cited as Kromayer-Veith.

⁵ H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* (1933), p. 156.

⁶ W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, vol. II, p. 153ff. henceforth cited as Tarn II.



Philip II and the Hypaspists

Author(s): R. D. Milns

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Sep., 1967, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967), pp. 509-512

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435007>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

tradition, of which Macrobius, with his new date, is a part, and Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius at least the symbolic climax. This development is itself an aspect, however paradoxical, of Christianisation. We are perhaps missing the point when we try to count the chances of Macrobius and his friends being Christians or pagans.¹²⁶ At their time, they would naturally have been Christians, and regarded themselves as such. That they should be so is not remarkable, but rather an integral part of their position and interests in a Christianised society.

Balliol College, Oxford.

JOHN MATTHEWS

¹²⁶ Cameron has pointed to the fact that Macrobius knows of the story of the slaughter of the Innocents (which he mentions in order to quote a witticism of Augustus!); *Macr. Sat.* ii 4. 11.

I would like to thank most sincerely Mr. P. R. L. Brown, Mr. Alan Cameron, Professor A. Chastagnol, and Professor R. Syme for reading this article and offering many criticisms and comments.

MISZELLE

PHILIP II AND THE HYPASPISTS

The hypaspists of Alexander the Great¹ have long been a fertile field for disputing scholars. The main area of controversy has been the question of the arms and armour of the troops: Berve² believed that they were more lightly armed than the phalangites (who themselves, in his account, were armed similarly to the Greek hoplite³); Kromayer-Veith⁴ make the hypaspists like peltasts, armed with shield and short spear; Parke⁵ calls them "a light-armed, spear-throwing force, . . . used with the phalanx just as professional peltasts were elsewhere combined with citizen hoplites." Tarn, however, successfully refuted these views,⁶ showing that the difference between the phalanx and the hypaspists was one

¹ In this article I am only concerned with the hypaspists who appear during the 4th century and not with later developments of the corps under the Diadochi. For a useful discussion of the later hypaspists (especially those of Philip V) see Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon*, App. II. p. 290ff.

² H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (1926), vol. I. 125, henceforth cited as Berve I. ³ Berve I 113.

⁴ J. Kromayer and G. Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer* (1928), henceforth cited as Kromayer-Veith.

⁵ H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* (1933), p. 156.

⁶ W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, vol. II, p. 153ff. henceforth cited as Tarn II.

of history and recruitment, not of armament (cf., "they were heavy infantry, as heavily armed as the phalanx".) However, the piece of evidence for this view, on which Tarn lays the greatest weight, was criticised by Hamilton,⁷ who returned to a more traditional opinion, similar to that of Berve. Griffith, in a very important article,⁸ while admitting the validity of Hamilton's refutation of Tarn's "final proof", points out that Hamilton's note "still does not . . . suggest strongly that the hypaspists had different arms from the rest, but merely that Tarn was mistaken in thinking that the passage of Arrian in question proved that they had the same armament." He then cites two other passages in Arrian that do, in fact, lend much support to Tarn's view.⁹

We may take it, then, as a strong possibility that the armament of phalangites and hypaspists was identical. Of what did this armament consist? Despite the statements of Berve¹⁰ and the accounts of Kromayer-Veith,¹¹ it would seem incorrect to class them as hoplites in that, in all probability, the phalangite – and hence the hypaspists – did not wear a breastplate,¹² and carried a smaller shield than the hoplite.¹³

An explanation for the smaller shield readily suggests itself – the 13 foot *sarissa* required the use of both hands to wield it; hence a smaller shield that could be carried on the arm, without requiring the support of the hand, was essential. But why the absence of breastplate? Griffith¹⁴ argues both plausibly and convincingly that the original cause may be assigned to social and economic necessity. The Macedonian peasantry in the middle 4th century¹⁵ were not of hoplite material (i.e. capable of equipping themselves with the full hoplite armament) and the Macedonian treasury in the early years of Philip's reign did not have the money to provide the phalangites with such armour (of which the breastplate was a *sine qua non*). Philip was thus in his early years improvising as best he could with the material at his disposal. Griffith further suggests that later in Philip's reign, when he *did* have the money to provide his phalanx with the missing breastplates, he deliberately did not do so because the success of the phalanx against hoplites up to that time had made it abundantly clear that further equipment – defensive armour in particular – was not necessary.

Now, if Griffith's arguments be accepted – and I can see no reason why they should not be – interesting light may also be thrown on the question of when the corps of the hypaspists was first instituted. Though it may be taken as generally accepted that chronologically the national levies of Macedonia from which the phalanx developed, preceded the formation of the hypaspists,¹⁶ there has only been, so far as I know, one serious attempt to assign an approxi-

⁷ J. R. Hamilton, C. Q. n.s. V 1955, p. 218.

⁸ G. T. Griffith, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. CLXXXIV, n.s. 4, 1956–57, p. 3 ff.

⁹ cf. Arrian III. 18. 1–2; IV. 25. 5–6.

¹⁰ Berve I 113.

¹¹ op. cit. p. 108; cf. C. A. H. VI. p.

¹² cf. Griffith, art. cit. p. 4 ff., arguing on the basis of Polyaeus (IV. 2.10) – admittedly not the best of evidence – and the Strymon inscriptions (see P. Roussel, Rev. Arch. III, 1934, 39 ff.; M. Feyel, Rev. Arch. VI, 1935, 29 ff.).

¹³ cf. Kromayer-Veith, p. 108.

¹⁴ art. cit. p. 7 ff.

¹⁵ i.e. when the phalanx was first introduced and brought to perfection. The original formation of the phalanx (following the generally accepted interpretation of Anaximenes F4 Jacoby (no. 72)) took place under Alexander II, but the credit for training and perfecting it must go to Philip II in the early years of his reign.

¹⁶ cf. Tarn II. 138–140.

mate date to this formation.¹⁷ Now it has been seen that in all probability the armament of phalanx and hypaspists was identical; and that the absence of full hoplite armament in the first part of Philip's reign was due to economic factors. To this may be added the likelihood that the original hypaspists were recruited and drawn from the ranks of the national levies,¹⁸ i.e. were from the same social class and background as the phalangites.

Now it may be argued with good reason that, though a King of Macedonia could not afford to equip the national levies with full armour, he surely could and would have been able to find the means so to equip his own personal and permanent bodyguard, had he wished. The fact, therefore, that the hypaspists, recruited from the same social background as the phalanx, were not given the full protective armour (and perhaps, with it, the shorter thrusting spear of the hoplite), would seem to indicate that their formation did not come about until it had been seen from the phalanx that such body armour was not essential and that its absence was more than compensated by the superior striking-power given by the *sarissa*; and this, as has been seen, was not until several years of Philip's reign had elapsed (perhaps any time after 356, when Philip gained possession of the Pangaeus gold-mines).¹⁹

This suggestion will enable us to offer an explanation for the total absence of references in contemporary sources (all *Greek*, of course) to the corps. Demosthenes and Anaximenes, both contemporaries of Philip, were fully acquainted with the πεζέταιροι of the phalanx,²⁰ and Theopompus²¹ had some vague idea of the term (see below). Of the hypaspists, however, no mention anywhere, though, in view of the eminence of the corps under Alexander, one might expect Demosthenes at least to have mentioned them when belittling the military virtues of the πεζέταιροι. The reason is obvious: in 349, when Demosthenes delivered the Second Olynthiac, the corps was of such recent innovation as to be either totally unknown to his Greek sources of information, or, if known, still in a sufficiently embryonic state as to be considered insignificant as a military force. Several years later, under Alexander's reign, the corps was still so little known to Greeks not intimately connected with the Macedonian military circle that it could be confused with the πεζέταιροι (a confusion no doubt made all the more easy because of the identical armament of the two bodies of troops). This confusion is best illustrated from the fragment of Theopompus, referred to above (see previous footnote). The scholiast on Dem. II. 17 says that: Θεόπομπος φησιν ὅτι ἐκ πάντων τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐπίλεκτοι οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ ἰσχυρότατοι ἐδορυφόρουν τὸν βασιλέα καὶ ἐκαλοῦντο πεζέταιροι. Theopompus correctly describes the function of the Bodyguard and, reasonably correct, the method of recruitment;²² but gives them the wrong name. This same error is repeated by Photius,²³ when he says that "Demosthenes thus names the bodyguards of Philip, who were both loyal and strong." Demosthenes, of course, does *not* say this; it is Theopompus, and Photius is obviously here quoting Theopompus (via the scholiast?)

¹⁷ see below, footnote 19; for a vague statement on this question cf. Tarn II 138: "some king formed from them (i.e. the national levies) a standing footguard, probably small, whose duty was to guard his person, not only in battle but at all times."

¹⁸ cf. Tarn II 138, quoted in previous footnote.

¹⁹ M. Bauer, Griech. Kriegsalt. 432, suggested early in Philip's reign as a possible date (see above, note 17). However, the grounds on which he reached this conclusion are untenable; see Appendix.

²⁰ Dem. Ol. II 17; Anaximenes, F4 (Jacoby).

²¹ Theopompus, F348 (Jacoby).

²² cf. Tarn II 138, quoted in footnote 17.

²³ Photius, s.v. πεζέταιροι.

without checking up on the text of Demosthenes. My suggestion, as well as explaining Greek silence, will also explain how *Macedonian* writers of Macedonian history, that is to say, men of the generation after Philip, such as Ptolemy, who had been brought up and lived their lives in the military affairs of their country, who, in fact, were born almost at the same time as the hypaspists were introduced, could speak of and refer to the corps as a matter of course.³⁴

Appendix

Bauer's argument is based on two passages of very dubious authenticity, one in Frontinus (IV. 1. 6), the other in Polyaeus (IV. 2. 10). Frontinus says that Philip, "cum primum constitueret exercitum" ("when first he was establishing his army" or "when he was establishing his first army"), reduced the number of soldier's servants; Polyaeus, describing Philip's route-march training, says that the troops carried, as well as their weapons, "all the utensils they required for their everyday life" (i.e. the things that soldiers' servants normally attended to). From these passages Bauer concludes that the hypaspists were originally the shield-bearers of the Macedonian hoplites (hence the name ὑπασπισται) and that when many of them lost this function as a result of Philip's reform, they became free to be employed as an infantry force. But Bauer is surely incorrect to equate ὑπασπισται, in the sense of "shield-bearer" or "esquire" (of a great noble; cf. Herodotus V. 111 for the Carian hypaspist of Onesilaus) with the σκευόφοροι (= the *calones* of Frontinus); and to suggest that Philip took the "inermis atque imbellis multitudo" of soldiers' servants and butlers from which to form the infantry corps d'elite of the Macedonian army is absurd in the extreme. It is, moreover, open to doubt whether phalangites would be in a position to afford servants. Hoplites of Greek states certainly could (cf. Herod. VII. 40) but, as was pointed out above, soldiers of the phalanx were neither socially nor economically on a par with a Greek hoplite. There were certainly grooms in the army of Alexander (cf. Arrian III. 13. 6 for these ἵπποχομοί), but these would be the attendants of troopers of the Companion Cavalry, who belonged to the landed gentry of Macedonia.

The University of New England

R. D. MILNS

³⁴ The name ὑπασπισται was obviously given to the corps to distinguish it from the πεζῆταιροι and was perhaps looked upon as a more innocuous sounding title for the King's bodyguard than δορυφόροι with its undertones of the mercenary guard of a tyrant; as Tarn has shown (II. 140) they were commonly called σωματοφύλακες, a term originally limited to the inner circle of 7 or 8 great nobles. We may agree with Tarn (II. 140) that the original hypaspists were the ἄγημα (perhaps 1,000 strong), expanded by the end of Philip's reign to 3,000. Such an expansion is quite in keeping with that of the other main Macedonian army divisions (eg. phalanx, from 10,000 to 24,000; Companion Cavalry from 600 to 1,800).



Back Matter

Source: *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 16, H. 4 (Sep., 1967)

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4435008>

Accessed: 21-11-2023 08:02 +00:00

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*

LOTHAR WICKERT

Theodor Mommsen

Eine Biographie

Band I: Lehrjahre (1817—1844)

1959. VIII, 570 S. 16 Bildtafeln. Ln DM 48.50, Kt DM 42.50

Band II: Wanderjahre (Frankreich-Italien)

1964. XVI, 448 S. 8 Bildtafeln. Ln 56.50, Kt DM 48.50

Band III und IV in Vorbereitung

Jahrzehntelanges intensives Quellenstudium liegt dieser ersten umfassenden Mommsenbiographie des Kölner Ordinarius für Alte Geschichte zugrunde. Die in zwei Bänden vorliegende Biographie enthält wichtige, zum Teil bisher unveröffentlichte, Dokumente im Wortlaut und wird damit zu einem umfassenden Quellenwerk, auf dem jede künftige Beschäftigung mit Mommsen aufbauen kann.

FRIEDRICH SCHAFFSTEIN

Wilhelm von Humboldt

Ein Lebensbild

1952. 360 Seiten. Leinen DM 17.50, Kartoniert DM 14.50

Das Lebensbild, das Friedrich Schaffstein von Wilhelm von Humboldt zeichnet, ist eine Monographie im besten Sinne des Wortes. Es gibt eine umfassende Darstellung seiner Persönlichkeit, seiner Beziehungen zu Goethe, Schiller, Metternich, Hardenberg und anderen bekannten Persönlichkeiten der damaligen Zeit.



VITTORIO KLOSTERMANN FRANKFURT AM MAIN

Hermann Strasburger **Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung**

*Sitzungsber. d. Wiss. Ges. Frankfurt/M., Bd. V, 3.
1966. 58 Seiten, brosch. DM 8,—*

Was Geschichte ist und was zu ihr gehört, wurde durch die griechische Geschichtsschreibung festgelegt. Das Anliegen dieser Untersuchung ist es, den Spuren der zu Grunde liegenden, eigentlich geschichtstheoretischen Vorstellungen nachzugehen.

Heinrich Chantraine **Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienste der römischen Kaiser**

Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur
1967. XIV, 419 Seiten, brosch. DM 70,—

Das vorliegende Werk wertet epigraphische und Papyrustexte aus. Es gibt Aufschlüsse über Beförderungschancen der Sklaven, Vermögensverhältnisse, Altersversorgung, das soziale Ansehen u. a. m.

J. A. Lencman **Die Sklaverei im mykenischen und homerischen Griechenland**

Aus dem Russischen übersetzt von M. Bräuer-Pospelova.
Herausgegeben von H. Bräuer und J. Vogt
1966. XII, 332 Seiten, Ln. DM 48,—

Dieser Band eröffnet eine Reihe von Monographien, die von der Akademie der Wissenschaften der UdSSR geplant sind und die die gesamte Geschichte der antiken Sklaverei behandeln sollen.

Christian Meier **Res publica amissa**

Studien zu Verfassung und Geschichte der späten römischen Republik
1966. VIII, 332 Seiten, Ln. DM 58,—

Der Baseler Althistoriker gibt erstmals eine umfassende Analyse der römischen Verfassungswirklichkeit.

Karl-Heinz Ziegler **Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich**

Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts
1964. XX, 158 Seiten, brosch. DM 24,—

Die Arbeit ist die erste rechtsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der mehr als drei Jahrhunderte dauernden Beziehungen zwischen dem Imperium Romanum und dem Partherreich.

Zu beziehen durch Ihre Buchhandlung · Prospekte durch den Verlag

FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH · WIESBADEN